3/

R E P O R T   R E S U M E S

ED 002 851   24

ROLE CONFLICT INCIDENCE IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION.

BY- TWYMAN, JOSEPH P.
MISSOURI UNIV., KANSAS CITY
REPORT NUMBER CRP-371-SUPPLEMENT-1   PUB DATE   61
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$7.80   195P.

DESCRIPTORS- *TEACHER ATTITUDES, *TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, *STUDENTS, *PARENTS, *COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

THE PRESENT STUDY WAS DIRECTED TOWARD THE IDENTIFICATION OF ROLE CONFLICTS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS IN A METROPOLITAN AREA. ROLE CONFLICTS WERE DEFINED AS THE EXISTENCE OF DISPARITIES BETWEEN COGNITIONS HELD FOR TEACHER BEHAVIOR OR OTHER CHARACTERISTICS BY MEMBERS OF VARIOUS SOCIAL POSITIONS. ONLY DISPARITIES LOGICALLY IMPLYING A POTENTIAL FOR PERSONAL DISCOMFORT ON THE PART OF THE TEACHER WERE STUDIED. INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED WITH TEACHERS, PARENTS, AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS. THEIR NORMS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR THE TEACHERS WERE COMPARED TO OBTAIN ROLE DISPARITIES. TWO INSTRUMENTS WERE USED--(1) AN OPEN-ENDED INSTRUMENT DESIGNED TO ELICIT COGNITIONS HELD FOR TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS, AND (2) A CLOSED-ENDED INSTRUMENT DESIGNED TO MEASURE COGNITIONS HELD FOR TEACHER BEHAVIORS. NUMEROUS AND SIGNIFICANT ROLE CONFLICTS WERE FOUND TO EXIST FOR TEACHER BEHAVIORS AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS. THE VARIETY AND NATURE OF THESE ROLE CONFLICTS HAVE IMPLICATIONS FOR AN UNDERSTANDING OF MANY OF OUR CURRENT EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS. THE FACT THAT MOST OF THE INTERPOSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS STEMMED FROM DISAGREEMENTS ON ELEMENTS OF THE TEACHER ROLE BY PUPILS VERSUS ADULTS AND BY PROFESSIONAL INTEREST GROUPS VERSUS NONPROFESSIONAL INTEREST GROUPS IMPLIES A LACK OF CLARITY AND CONSENSUS ON METHODS FOR ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES IN OUR PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM. A REPLICATION OF THIS STUDY IN OTHER COMMUNITIES WITH REFINED INSTRUMENTS AND PROCEDURES IS RECOMMENDED. (GC)

ED 002851

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ROLE CONFLICT INCIDENCE IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION

A DISSERTATION IN
EDUCATION

Presented to the Faculty of the University
of Kansas City in partial fulfillment of
the requirements of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

by
JOSEPH PASCHAL TWYMAN

B. A., University of Kansas City, 1955
M. A., University of Kansas City, 1959

Kansas City, Missouri
1961

ABSTRACT

Purpose and Design

This study was conducted within a role theory framework and was directed toward the identification of role conflicts for public school teachers in the Greater Kansas City Metropolitan Area. Role conflict was defined as the existence of disparities between cognitions held for teacher behaviors or other characteristics by members of various social positions. Ninety-eight teachers, 261 parents, 237 pupils, and sixty-seven school officials were interviewed, and their norms and expectations for the teacher were compared to obtain role disparities. All respondents were selected on a stratified-random basis from public schools in the sampling area.

Two data collection instruments were used. One was an open-ended instrument designed to elicit cognitions for general teacher characteristics, and the other was a closed-ended instrument designed to measure cognitions held for thirty selected teacher behaviors. On both instruments, cognitions were indicated by respondents in the form of likes (positive norms), dislikes (negative norms), and expectations.

Data relevant to both general teacher characteristics and teacher behaviors were analyzed to discover the extent to which there were significant differences among the various positions in terms of what was liked, disliked, and expected of teachers (inter-positionally determined conflict). Analyses were also made to discover discrepancies between norms and expectations held for teachers by members of the same position

(intra-positionally determined conflict). The major statistical techniques used in the study included the t test and the Mann-Whitney z_U test.

Major Findings

For the inter-positional analyses of data pertaining to general teacher characteristics, only disparities having random significance were found. For the intra-positional analyses of these same data, however, disparities having more than random significance were found for all positions with the exception of school officials. Most of these disparities occurred when contrasting expectations and positive norms. The majority of the significant intra-positional disparities occurred within the parent and pupil positions. Teacher exhibited relatively few significant disparities. Cognitive disparities among parents and among pupils were based primarily on teacher characteristics very general in nature, whereas the discrepancies among teachers were based more on specific characteristics.

In the analyses of data for teacher behaviors, significant disparities were found for both the inter-positional and intra-positional comparisons. For the inter-positional comparisons, most of the disparities centered on positive and negative norms for teacher behaviors and were based on behaviors having to do with teacher self-indulgence, maintenance of order, and community participation. The greatest number of overall disparities in the inter-positional analyses occurred when comparing pupils with all other adults (teachers, parents, and school officials) and when comparing parents with the professional interest groups (teachers and school officials).

In the intra-positional comparisons, most of the disparities stemmed from differences between expectations and negative norms and differences between positive norms and negative norms. The greatest proportion of significant disparities over teacher behaviors occurred within the parent and teacher positions. Pupils and school officials exhibited very few disparities. As was the case with the inter-positional comparisons, the majority of the disparities centered on behaviors related to teacher self-indulgence, maintenance of order, and community participation.

Conclusions

Numerous and significant cognitive disparities were found to exist for the behavior and other characteristics of the public school teacher. These disparities were found to be related to type of cognition, social position represented by the respondent, and to the nature of the teacher characteristic or behavior under consideration. Such consistent disagreements on the role of the teacher by those concerned with our educational system may tend to account for teacher unhappiness and lead to a high rate of turnover. Attempts should be made, using refined instruments and procedures, to replicate these findings in other communities.

This abstract of about 600 words is approved as to form and content.

Signed Bruce J. Biddle
Professor in charge of dissertation

This dissertation, submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Ph.D. degree, by

Joseph Paschal Twyman

not proof-read, has been approved for the Department of

Education

by

Bruce J. Biddle

Robert E. Sweitzer

John J. Hanitchak

Leo W. Myers

Date July 21, 1961

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his abiding gratitude to Dr. Bruce J. Biddle, Chairman of the Advisory Committee, for his perceptive counsel and sympathetic guidance throughout this research. Appreciation is also due Dr. Robert E. Sweitzer, Dr. John J. Hanitchak, and Dr. Leo Myers for their help and suggestions as members of the writer's committee.

This study obviously could not have been completed without the financial support received from the United States Office of Education and the University of Kansas City. Also, the aid offered by the staff of the Social Psychology Laboratory at the University of Missouri should be recognized. Finally, the personnel of the computing centers at the University of Missouri and Oklahoma State University are thanked for their part in expediting data analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vi

LIST OF TABLES x

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS xiii

Chapter

I. THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM 1

Introduction
General Background and Need for the Study
The Kansas City Teacher Role Project
General Findings

II. THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 4

Introduction
Definitions of Terms and Concepts
Role Conflict
Related Literature
Hypotheses of the Study

III. THE METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY 23

Introduction
Sample and Population
Instrumentation and Data Collection
Data Analysis
Limitations

IV. THE CONTENT AREAS USED IN ASSESSING TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS 39

Introduction
Content Areas Chosen for Study
Methods of Analysis
The Findings
Chapter Summary

TABLE OF CONTENTS--*Continued*

Chapter Page

V. ROLE CONFLICT BASED ON SCALED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS 62

Introduction
Inter-Positionally Determined Conflict
Intra-Positionally Determined Conflict
Chapter Summary

VI. ROLE CONFLICT BASED ON SCALED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER BEHAVIORS 82

Introduction
Inter-Positionally Determined Conflict
Intra-Positionally Determined Conflict
Chapter Summary

VII. RESULTS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS 113

Review of the Purpose and Design of the Study
Summary of Findings
Implications
Recommendations

APPENDICES

A-1. TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS QUESTIONNAIRE, FORM TWO-A 127

A-2. TEACHER BEHAVIOR SCALE--POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE NORMS, FORM FOUR-A 129

A-3. TEACHER BEHAVIOR SCALE--EXPECTATIONS, FORM FOUR-A 132

A-4. A COMPLETE LIST OF CONTENT AREAS USED IN FORM FOUR 135

A-5. A COMPLETE LIST OF CONTENT AREAS USED FOR THE CODING OF FORM TWO DATA 136

B-1. CONTENT AREAS USED BY FIVE PER CENT OR MORE OF ALL RESPONDENTS (FORM TWO) 139

B-2. PERCENTAGE USE BY POSITION OF CONTENT AREAS DESCRIPTIVE OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS--POSITIVE NORMS (FORM TWO) . . 141

B-3. PERCENTAGE USE BY POSITION OF CONTENT AREAS DESCRIPTIVE OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS--NEGATIVE NORMS (FORM TWO) . . 146

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

B-4. PERCENTAGE USE BY POSITION OF CONTENT AREAS DESCRIPTIVE OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS--EXPECTATIONS (FORM TWO) . . . 150

B-5. POSITIONAL MEANS FOR POINT-SPREAD ON CONTENT AREAS DESCRIPTIVE OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS--POSITIVE NORMS (FORM TWO) 154

B-6. POSITIONAL MEANS FOR POINT-SPREAD ON CONTENT AREAS DESCRIPTIVE OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS--NEGATIVE NORMS (FORM TWO) 158

B-7. POSITIONAL MEANS FOR POINT-SPREAD ON CONTENT AREAS DESCRIPTIVE OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS--EXPECTATIONS (FORM TWO) 162

B-8. POSITIONAL MEANS FOR COGNITIONS DEALING WITH TEACHER BEHAVIORS--POSITIVE NORMS (FORM FOUR) 166

B-9. POSITIONAL MEANS FOR COGNITIONS DEALING WITH TEACHER BEHAVIORS--NEGATIVE NORMS (FORM FOUR) 170

B-10. POSITIONAL MEANS FOR COGNITIONS DEALING WITH TEACHER BEHAVIORS--EXPECTATIONS (FORM FOUR) 174

BIBLIOGRAPHY 178

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Number and Percentage of Public Schools in the Population by Community Type and Other Characteristics. . 25

2. Number and Percentage of Public Schools in the Final Sample by Community Type and Other Characteristics . . . 27

3. The Number of Respondents, by Position; Chosen from Each of the Four Community Types 30

4. The Number of Respondents, by Position, Actually Interviewed in Each of the Four Community Types 31

5. Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Teacher Professionalism and Discipline" 42

6. Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Job-Related Teacher Characteristics" 45

7. Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Teacher Ability and Interest" 47

8. Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Teacher Rapport and Orderliness". 48

9. Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Teacher Ethics" 50

10. Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Reasonableness of Teacher Behavior" 51

11. Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Emotional Support of Pupils" 52

12. Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Teacher Motivation and Interaction" 54

13. Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Teacher Improvement and Humor" 55

14-A. Number of Significant Differences in Content Area Usage by Position, Code Dimension, and Cognition Type 56

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table Page

14-B. Grand Totals for Significant Differences in Content Area Usage by Code Dimension and Cognition Type 58

15. Inter-Positional Role Conflicts, by Positional Comparison, Content Area, and Cognition Type 64

16. Intra-Positional Role Conflicts, Based on Cognitive Discrepancies Among Teachers 67

17. Intra-Positional Role Conflicts, Based on Cognitive Discrepancies Among Parents 71

18. Intra-Positional Role Conflicts, Based on Cognitive Discrepancies Among Pupils 74

19. Intra-Positional Role Conflicts, Based on Cognitive Discrepancies Among School Officials 76

20. Number of Significant Intra-Positional Disparities by Position and Type of Cognitive Comparison 77

21. Number of Significant Intra-Positional Disparities by Position and Content Area Dimension 78

22. Significant Inter-Positional Role Conflicts for "Maintenance of Order" 84

23. Significant Inter-Positional Role Conflicts for "Deviancy Control" 86

24. Significant Inter-Positional Role Conflicts for "Teacher Self-Indulgence" 87

25. Significant Inter-Positional Role Conflicts for "Community Participation" 89

26. Significant Inter-Positional Role Conflicts for "Teacher Cooperation". 90

27. Significant Inter-Positional Role Conflicts for "Miscellaneous Behavior Items". 92

28. Role Conflicts for Teacher Behaviors Based on Cognitive Discrepancies Among Teachers 95

29. Role Conflicts for Teacher Behaviors Based on Cognitive Discrepancies Among Parents 98

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table		Page
30.	Role Conflicts for Teacher Behaviors Based on Cognitive Discrepancies Among Pupils	102
31.	Role Conflicts for Teacher Behaviors Based on Cognitive Discrepancies Among School Officials	105
32.	Number of Significant Inter-Positional Role Conflicts, by Behavior Item Category, Positional Comparison, and Cognition	106
33.	Number of Significant Inter-Positional Role Conflicts, by Positional Comparison	108
34.	Number of Significant Intra-Positional Role Conflicts, by Behavior Item Category, Position, and Cognitive Comparison	110
35.	Number of Significant Intra-Positional Role Conflicts, by Position	112

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure Page

1. Predominant Positional Usage of Content Area, by Cognition Type 60

2. Content Areas Involved Uniquely in Positional Cognitive Disparities 80

3. Content Areas Common to Teachers, Parents, and Pupils for Intra-Positional Disparities 81

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

This dissertation reports an investigation of several varieties of role conflict for public school teachers in a metropolitan area. Role conflict was defined as the existence of disparities between cognitions held for teacher behavior or other characteristics by teachers, parents, pupils and school officials. Respondents, selected on a stratified-random basis from the Greater Kansas City Metropolitan Area, were interviewed and their cognitions for teachers analyzed for discrepancies. Results are interpreted for their implications for American education and role theory.

General Background and Need for the Study

In recent years the status of American public education has been the subject of concern of both educator and layman. Interest has been expressed concerning such issues as status of professional educators, teacher turnover, quality of educational offerings, and teaching methods employed in the classroom. Numerous "investigations" have been made seeking answers to these issues.

Perhaps the most significant trend in recent investigations has been the application of social science theories and empirical methods to education. Such an approach recognizes that significant social and educational problems are inherently related and that an interdisciplinary approach offers a variety of benefits. Encouragement has been given this orientation by various private foundations and governmental agencies offering financial aid to these interdisciplinary investigations.

The school teacher, as a member of a public institution, has traditionally been subject to a large number of constraints and demands. The status, behavior, and other characteristics of teachers are of interest to many--including pupils, parents, lay community members, administrators, various pressure groups and organizations, other teachers, and those associated with teacher training institutions. A persistent problem in the field of education has been one of operationally defining certain areas of agreement and disagreement among such groups regarding the role and function of the teacher.

The present study has been made to determine the extent of cognitive disagreement among four social positions (teachers, parents, pupils, and school officials) on what teachers do, should, and should not do. Also, an attempt was made to determine the extent of cognitive disagreement among these positions on other characteristics displayed by teachers and the desirability of such teacher characteristics. Areas of significant disagreement in cognitions held for teacher behavior or other characteristics have been identified as areas of role conflict. It was felt that a study of role conflict incidence should indicate reasons for unsatisfactory on-the-job performance by teachers and the excessive teacher turnover rate. Cognitive disparities are likely to provide the basis for differential and/or incongruent behaviors directed toward (or evaluations made about) the teacher. Personal discomfort and worry on the part of the teacher may stem directly from pressures generated by cognitive disparity.

The Kansas City Teacher Role Project

The present study has stemmed from a project conducted during a two-year period from 1958 to 1960 at the University of Kansas City, entitled "Role of the Teacher and Occupational Choice."[1] In this larger project, an attempt was made to explore the role of the public school teacher in the Greater Kansas City Area through the collection of field study data from teachers, parents, public school pupils, school administrators and supervisors, school board members, and college students. Results from the larger study have been used as a basis for making predictions about the attitudes of young persons contemplating a career in public school teaching.[2] Both the larger research project and the present study have been conducted within a general role theory framework.

General Findings

Numerous and significant cognitive discrepancies were found to exist for the behavior and other characteristics of public school teachers. These discrepancies were found to be systematically related to cognition type, positions holding the cognitions, and to the nature of the teacher characteristic under consideration. Applications of these findings to an understanding of teacher role are discussed in the dissertation, and implications for role theory are explored.

---

[1] The Research reported herein was part of a larger project entitled "Role of the Teacher and Occupational Choice" and was conducted at the School of Education, University of Kansas City, pursuant to Contract 371 (7788) with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

[2] B. J. Biddle, J. P. Twyman and E. F. Rankin, Jr., "The Role of the Teacher and Occupational Choice," School Review (forthcoming).

CHAPTER II

THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

The major theoretical orientation used in the present study has been role theory. Role theory properly falls within and is a central focus of the field of social psychology. It provides a framework for studying certain aspects of social behavior within stable social systems. Role theory deals with both the patterns of behaviors which are common to persons or to groups of persons (positions) and with a variety of cognitions held about these patterns by social observers. The terminological and conceptual distinctions of role theory generally center around a description of the patterns or of the cognitions. The propositions of role theory are concerned with the effects of the patterns upon the cognitions or of the latter upon the former.

During the past decade there has been an increasing use of role-related terms and concepts in both theoretical and empirical papers and considerable research has been generated out of this general area. However, despite the growing popularity of this field, several general problems are at present standing in the way of role theory becoming a true theoretical structure. First, there is a general lack of agreement on concepts rightfully belonging to this area. Secondly, there is a lack of agreement on terms applying to these concepts. Finally, there is a lack of an accepted propositional structure which constitutes the core of the theory.

Recent reviews of the status of role theory have emphasized the magnitude of the conceptual, terminological and propositional problems facing role theory[3], [4] while other writers, such as Rommetveit[5] and Parsons[6], [7] have attempted to develop and use a consistent series of distinctions. Gross, *et. al.*[8] have recently initiated several large scale research projects within the field of education and have begun the assembly of a series of interrelated propositions in role theory. However, up to the present time, no universal acceptance of any of the proposed systems has been forthcoming.

In common with other terms and concepts in role theory, role conflict has also enjoyed recently a great deal of popularity in the literature. Role conflict has been studied as an object of analysis in its own right and has been seen as a cause or resultant of social action and reaction. As is the case with other terms in role theory, unfortunately, role conflict has been used for a number of quite different concepts. In general, however, role conflict always seems to imply problems faced by the individual stemming from his social environment and specific to himself or to his social position.

---

[3] L. J. Neiman and J. W. Hughes, "The Problem of the Concept of Role - A Re-survey of the Literature," *Social Forces*, XXX (December, 1951).

[4] Theodore R. Sarbin, "Role Theory," *Handbook of Social Psychology*, ed. Gardner Lindzey, I (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954).

[5] Ragnar Rommetveit, *Social Norms and Roles* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954).

[6] Talcott Parsons, *The Social System* (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951).

[7] Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (eds.), *Toward a General Theory of Action* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951).

[8] Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, *Explorations in Role Analysis* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958).

This chapter presents the theoretical framework used in the present study. Several conceptual and terminological distinctions are made and results from a review of related literature are presented. Finally, a statement of hypotheses for the study is made.

Definitions of Terms and Concepts

The present study was based upon a consistent and explicit set of distinctions and definitions for role theory which were developed in conjunction with the Kansas City Teacher Role Study. Terms applicable to this dissertation are defined below:

1. *Cognitions* - the mapping structures presumed to be maintained by individuals in social situations. Cognitions are modeled after the physical and social environments in which people interact and are used by individuals in structuring behavior. Classes of cognitions include expectations, positive norms, and negative norms.

2. *Expectations* (non-valued cognitions) - the cognitions maintained by a person consisting of subjective probability maps concerned with the incidence of a set of behaviors or other characteristics of another person or position.

3. *Positive Norms* (valued cognitions) - the cognitions maintained by a person consisting of an affective map about desired behaviors or other characteristics of another person or position.

4. *Negative Norms* (valued cognitions) - the cognitions maintained by a person consisting of an affective map about undesired behaviors or other characteristics of another person or position.

5. *First-order Cognitions* - the cognitions maintained by persons about social objects or events.

6. *Second-order Cognitions* - the cognitions maintained by persons about the cognitions of others. Second-order cognitions include *Attributed Norms* (expectations about the norms of others) and *Attributed Expectations* (expectations about the expectations of others).

7. *Role* - the set of cognitions maintained about the person occupying a position by one or more persons.

8. *Role Conflict* - the existence of disparate cognitions which may be assumed to lead to personal discomfort for position members.

9. **Primary Position Members** - the members of a subject group whose conflict is being studied. (Teachers are primary position members in the present study.)

10. **Alter Position Members** - the members of a subject group or groups other than the primary position. These alter position members are interested in or associate with primary position members and generally hold cognitions about primary position members. (Alter positions included in this study are parents, public school pupils, and school officials.)

Role Conflict

Role Conflict Definitions

The writer and others have developed a basic conceptual system for categorizing and defining the various role conflict concepts previously used in the literature.[9] This system is sufficiently broad so as to include most of the distinctions made by other writers in the field. In this treatment of the concept of role conflict, the authors have identified several major forms of role conflict definitions.

Behavioral Pressure Conflict

This is conflict for the individual arising directly from dissonant pressures upon himself as a person or upon the position which he represents in a social situation. Several examples of this form of role conflict may be given. Two alter positions may behave disparately toward a given primary position, or a person may be driven to keep up various standards of dress or behavior which are impossible due to certain physical or social conditions under which he finds himself. In addition, the demands placed upon such a person as a position member may conflict directly with personal needs. In varying degrees, all of these types of pressures stem from the person's environment and lead to personal discomfort. Role conflict definitions at this level do not necessitate that the person experiencing the discomfort understand the reasons for it.

---

[9] Bruce J. Biddle, J. P. Twyman and E. F. Rankin, Jr., *The Concept of Role Conflict*. (Forthcoming as a monograph, presently available in dittoed form, 1960).

Individual Cognitive Disparity Conflict

This is conflict defined as lying entirely within the cognitive structure of an individual. Thus, if a person holds ambivalent norms for himself, or he attributes norms or expectations to another for himself which he finds it unpleasant to perform, or if he is ambivalent in cognitions held for others, he would be experiencing role conflict. Role conflict defined at this level need not be veridical for discomfort to result. A person may, for example, incorrectly attribute norms to another and suffer intense conflict without these attributed norms being even remotely related to norms actually held by the other.

Multi-Person Cognitive Disparity Conflict

This is conflict defined as stemming directly from discrepant norms and expectations which are "really" held by others. For example, various members of a given position may disagree on what they expect of themselves. Or two distinct positions, for example school officials and parents, may disagree strongly on the kinds of behavior they expect or desire from teachers in various situations. There are only a limited number of ways in which the reality of cognitive structures held by others may enter the life space of the individual. In general, the individual can set up a second-order cognitive structure which matches the externally held cognitions or he may be imposed upon by behavioral pressures which he may or may not understand.

Behavior-Cognition Conflict

This is conflict generated by disparities between cognitions held by the individual and the behaviors of himself or others. For example, the member of a position may hold norms for the behavior of such position members but may find his own behavior discrepant from those norms. Also, an individual might observe a system of behavior among others which is in significant discord with norms he strongly holds for them. Discomfort for the individual at this level of role conflict definition stems from an inability to adjust either his social world or his cognitive structure.

Using these four basic forms of role conflict definitions, the writer and others have identified or distinguished sixty-six logical types of role conflict. Of this total number, only ten different types have been considered by writers and researchers in the field. The majority of the role conflict definitions used by others stem from multi-person cognitive disparities.[10]

Variations of Multi-Person Cognitive Disparities

The present study was concerned with several varieties of role conflict defined at the multi-person cognitive disparity level. In dealing with role conflict as defined in terms of disparate cognitions held for the behavior and characteristics of teachers by parents, pupils, other teachers, and school officials, it was possible to identify several varieties of conflict.

Disparities may exist between expectations, positive norms, or negative norms. Each of these three types of cognitions may be held for the presence (high frequency) or absence (low frequency) of the teacher behavior or characteristic specified. Only these cognitive disparities which logically imply a potential for personal discomfort on the part of the teacher should be considered as producing role conflict and were studied in the present research. This includes all disparities involving cognitions for teacher behavior and other characteristics which cannot at the same time be fulfilled or satisfied by the teacher.

---

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 31-47.

Multi-person cognitive disparities may be either inter-positionally or intra-positionally determined. The inter-positionally determined disparities arise when members of two or more positions (e.g., teachers and parents) hold disparate cognitions for the behavior or other characteristics of position members under study. Intra-positionally determined disparities are based on disparate cognitions held for the behavior or other characteristics of teachers by different members of a single position (that is, when there are disparities among parents, etc.). Varieties of inter-positionally determined conflict considered in the present study included:

1. Expectation vs. Expectation Disparities - where the teacher was by members of one position expected to perform a certain amount of a behavior or have a certain degree of another characteristic and expected by members of another position to perform a different amount of the behavior or have a different degree of the characteristic.

2. Positive Norm vs. Positive Norm Disparities - where the members of one position liked for teachers to perform a certain amount of a behavior or have a certain degree of another characteristic and the members of another position liked different amounts of this behavior or characteristic.

3. Negative Norm vs. Negative Norm Disparities - where the members of one position disliked for teachers to perform a certain amount of a behavior or have a certain degree of another characteristic and the members of another position disliked different amounts of this behavior or characteristic.

Three varieties of intra-positionally determined conflict were considered in the present research. They included:

1. Expectation vs. Positive Norm Disparities - where the members of a given position expected teachers to perform a certain

amount of a behavior or have a certain degree of another characteristic but liked different amounts of this behavior or characteristic.

2. *Expectation vs. Negative Norm Disparities* - where the members of a given position expected teachers to perform a certain amount of a behavior or have a certain degree of a characteristic but disliked this same amount of the behavior or characteristic.

3. *Positive Norm vs. Negative Norm Disparities* - where the members of a given position both liked and disliked for teachers to perform a certain amount of a behavior or have a certain degree of a characteristic.

Each of the above six varieties of cognitive disparity implies, in some combination and measure, that there is disagreement among certain persons regarding what they think teachers are like and what they think teachers should and should not be like. These cognitive disparities often provide the basis for differential evaluations of or actions toward teachers and thereby lead to their personal discomfort. Teachers confronted with such disparate cognitions, may, if they recognize the conflicts, ponder about various resolution techniques and attempt to adjust in some manner to the incompatible cognitions. Or, if the teacher does not recognize the disparate cognitions, he may blindly pursue his present course of action and suffer uncomfortable pressures which he does not understand.

Related Literature

The Role of the Public School Teacher

Few studies have been made of role conflicts for public school teachers to date. However, over the past fifty years there have been a number of empirical studies relevant to the role of the teacher. Most of these studies have had as their concern the cognitions held about public school teachers by members of certain positions. A few have been concerned with cognitions held for teachers by more than one position. Norms for the behavior of teachers in general have been studied by Cook and Almack,[11] Fishburn,[12] and Jenkins and Lippitt.[13] Cook and Almack studied teacher community participation and investigated norms for the behavior of public school teachers held by school board members, public school teachers and public school pupils. The content areas for teacher behavior in this study were selected upon the basis of an estimate of behaviors which were the object of community taboos. The study by Fishburn was concerned with norms held for the behavior of public school teachers by teachers and administrators and was based on behavior content areas selected from previous literature. Jenkins and Lippitt studied norms for the behavior of teachers as held by parents and public school pupils. Content areas were secured by means of open-ended questions. A study by Jordan[14] was concerned with norms for teacher traits as held by public school pupils, teachers, supervisors and patrons. Content area items for this study were selected on the basis of pilot study interviews and a survey of relevant literature. Norms for both teacher behaviors and traits were studied by Greenhoe,[15] who collected data from school board members, lay persons, teachers and college students.

---

[11] L. A. Cook and R. B. Almack, "The Community Participation of Two Thousand, Eight Hundred Seventy Ohio Teachers," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXV (February, 1939), 107.

[12] C. E. Fishburn, "Teacher Role Perception in the Secondary Schools of One Community" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1955).

[13] D. H. Jenkins and R. Lippitt, Inter-personal Perceptions of Teachers, Students, and Parents (Washington, D. C.: Division of Adult Education Service, National Education Association, 1951).

[14] F. Jordan, "A Study of Personal and Social Traits in Relation to High School Teaching," Journal of Educational Sociology, III (September, 1939), 27.

[15] F. Greenhoe, "Community Contacts of Public School Teachers," Elementary School Journal, XL (March, 1940), 497.

Content area items were based primarily on pilot study interviews. One study was found which dealt with both expectations and norms for teacher behaviors and traits. This was a national study conducted by Charters and Waples,[16] and was concerned, on the one hand, with norms held by administrators for the traits of teachers in each of five classifications (senior high, junior high, intermediate, kindergarten-primary, and rural). A second phase of the study was concerned with both expectations and norms for the behavior of senior high, junior high, intermediate, kindergarten-primary, rural, and subject matter teachers as held by college students, public school teachers, professors, supervisors and principals. All of these studies, based on cognitions for teachers as held by more than one position, have been descriptive in nature and have not attempted to operationally define and analyze statistically the extent of agreement or disagreement among cognitions held.

The majority of teacher role studies have been based on cognitions held for teachers by members of only one position. Studies for which this holds include those dealing with norms for the behavior of teachers in general by Cowan,[17] Davies,[18] Koopman,[19] and Tiedeman.[20]

---

[16] W. W. Charters and D. Waples, The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929).

[17] P. H. Cowan, "Teacher Role Perception in Colleges and Universities" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1956).

[18] J. E. Davies, "What are the Traits of the Good Teacher from the Standpoint of Junior High School Pupils?" School and Society, XXXVIII (November, 1933), 649.

[19] M. O. Koopman, "What One Midwestern Community Thinks of Its Teachers," Educational Research Bulletin, XXV (June, 1946), 34.

[20] S. C. Tiedeman, "A Study of Pupil-Teacher Relationships," Journal of Educational Research, XXXV (May, 1942), 657.

The study by Gowan was based on content areas selected from previous literature in the field and the respondents were college instructors. Salient content areas were given by public school pupils in the form of responses to open-ended questions in the studies by Davies and Tiedeman. Community members were used as respondents in the Koopman study, with content areas being based on pilot study interviews and a review of related literature. Other studies, also based on data collected from a single position, include a number dealing with norms for both the behavior and traits of teachers in general. Included within this category are studies by Bird,[21] Cobb,[22] Dallolio,[23], Haer,[24] Smith,[25] and Spears.[26] The studies by Bird, Cobb and Dallolio were based on data collected from public high school pupils while that of Haer was based on data from community members; that of Smith on data collected from parents; and the study of Spears based on cognitions collected from college students. All of these studies except those of Cobb and Haer utilized content areas secured from open-ended responses. The method of choosing content areas was not specified by Cobb and Haer. Two studies dealing with norms for teacher behaviors and traits were concerned, not with teachers in general, but with cognitions held for teacher sub-positions. Bock[27] and Livingood[28] studied norms held by public school pupils for high school teachers. Content areas in the study by Bock were secured by means of open-ended questions, while the method of choosing content areas was not specified by Livingood.

---

[21] G. E. Bird, "Pupils' Estimates of Teachers," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, VIII (January, 1917), 35.

[22] F. R. Cobb, "High School Seniors Attitudes Toward the Teaching Profession," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, XXXVI (January, 1952), 140.

[23] H. C. Dellolio, "Teachers on Trial: A Group of Pupils Tell What They Like in Teachers," *Clearing House*, XXIX (April, 1955), 497.

[24] J. Haer, "The Public Views the Teacher," *Journal of Teacher Education*, IV (September, 1953), 202.

[25] V. F. Smith, "What Kind of Teachers do Parents Like? What Kind of Parents do Teachers Like?" *Understanding the Child*, XXII (October, 1953), 99.

[26] H. Spears, "What Disturbs the Beginning Teacher," *School Review*, LIII (October, 1945), 458.

A few studies, based on data collected from one position, have been concerned with expectations for teachers in general. Biber and Lewis[29] studied the expectations of elementary pupils for public school teacher behaviors using open-ended questions to elicit content areas, while McGill[30] and Richey and Fox[31] studied expectations for teacher traits as held by college students. Content areas were secured by means of open-ended questions in the study by McGill, while the method of choosing content areas was not specified in the study by Richey and Fox. Expectations for both teacher behaviors and traits were studied by Corey[32] and Johnson.[33] Corey's findings were based on data collected from college students while respondents were high school pupils in the study by Johnson. Content areas were secured by means of open-ended questions in the study by Johnson, whereas the method of choosing content areas was not specified in the study by Gorey.

---

[27] W. F. Bock, "The High School Teacher from the Pupil's Point of View," *Pedagogical Seminary*, XII (September, 1905), 239.

[28] T. G. Livingood, "Educational Research and Statistics--Estimates of High School Seniors," *School and Society*, XLI (April, 1935), 550.

[29] B. Biber and C. Lewis, *An Experimental Study of What Young Children Expect of Their Teachers* ("Journal Press Publications: Genetic Psychology Monographs," Vol. XL, No. 1; Provincetown, Mass.: Journal Press, 1949), p. 3.

[30] E. H. McGill, "The School Teacher Stereotype," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, IV (June, 1931), 642.

[31] R. W. Richey and W. H. Fox, "How Do Teachers Compare with Other Community Members?" *Educational Research Bulletin*, XXVII (December, 1948), 238.

[32] S. M. Corey, "Attitudes Toward Teaching and Professional Training," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, XXXIII (October, 1937), 521.

[33] A. H. Johnson, "The Responses of High School Seniors to a Set of Structured Situations Concerning Teaching as a Career," *Journal of Experimental Education*, XXVI (June, 1958), 263.

Only two studies were found which dealt with both expectations and norms for public school teachers. Beale[34] studied norms and expectations held for the behavior of public school teachers by other teachers. Content areas for behavior were selected from pilot study interviews with teachers. Terrien[35] studied expectations and norms for both teacher behaviors and traits as held by members of the lay public. The basis for the selection of content areas was not specified.

Studies dealing explicitly with the problem of teacher role conflict include those of Getzels and Guba[36] and Doyle.[37] The study by Getzels and Guba was concerned with discrepancies between what community members wanted the teacher to do as a teacher and what they wanted the teacher to do as a church member, family member, voter, etc. This study identified conflicts experienced by teachers as a result of their multiple position occupancy, that is, as teachers and community members. Behavioral content areas were selected upon the basis of previous interviews with other teachers. The study by Doyle was concerned with the divergence and convergence of norms for public school teacher behavior in school settings. Role conflicts were viewed in this research as stemming from single position occupancy, where conflicting norms for teacher behavior were held by relevant groups associating with the teacher. The basis of selection for behavioral content areas was not specified. Other recent studies dealing with role conflict in the field of education are to be reviewed by Getzels in a chapter of a forthcoming publication.[38]

---

[34] H. K. Beale, *Are American Teachers Free?* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936).

[35] F. Terrien, "Who Thinks What About Educators?" *American Journal of Sociology*, LIX (September, 1953), 150.

[36] J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, XXIX (September, 1955), 30.

[37] Louis A. Doyle, "Convergence and Divergence in the Role Expectations of Elementary Teachers," *College of Education Quarterly*, IV (January, 1958), 3.

Several general conclusions may be stated with regard to previous empirical investigations related to teacher role.

1. Most investigations have been simply empirical descriptions of cognitions related to teacher role, with little or no theoretical orientation.
2. Relatively few studies have dealt with expectations. When cognitions are viewed in relation to role theory, it becomes obvious that the concepts of role and role conflict must include more than one type of cognition.
3. Most studies have been confined to an investigation of the cognitions of only one social position. It is clear that if teacher behavior is viewed as a function of norms and expectations held for teachers by members of various social positions, role studies must of necessity consider multiple sources of cognitions by selecting several alter groups who typically interact with teachers in various ways.
4. The basis for selecting content areas for study in the various investigations is relatively unclear. Many investigations have simply "reviewed the literature" for items to be later imposed upon respondents without regard for the question of saliency.

Literature Within the General Area of Role Conflict

The author and others, in attempting to develop a conceptual scheme for categorizing the various concepts of role conflict, have examined all journal articles, monographs, dissertations and books appearing prior to 1960 which dealt with role conflict as a major focus. Coverage was based upon a review of abstracting journals and services, a survey of selected journals in which role conflict materials were likely to be found, and a follow-up of bibliographic references used in other publications. Complete results of this intensive survey of the literature are to be found reported elsewhere.[39]

---

[38] J. W. Getzels, "Role Conflict Studies in Education," *The Social Psychology of Education*, eds. W. W. Charters, Jr. and N. L. Gage, (forthcoming).

General findings from this review of the literature include the fact that no writers or investigators have conceptualized or studied role conflict entirely at the behavioral pressure level. Individual cognitive disparity conflict has been studied by Gross[40] and Jambor,[41] while Ort,[42, 43] was the only investigator dealing with behavior-cognition conflict. Numerous writers have conceptualized or studied role conflicts defined at the multi-person cognitive disparity level.

---

[39] Biddle, Twyman, and Rankin, *loc. cit.*

[40] Gross, Mason, and McEachern, *loc. cit.*

[41] Helen H. Jambor, "Discrepancies in Role Expectations for the Supervisory Position--A Concern of Social Work Administration" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1954).

[42] Robert S. Ort, "A Study of Role-Conflicts as Related to Class Level," *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLVII (April, 1952), 425.

[43] Robert S. Ort, "A Study of Role-Conflicts as Related to Happiness in Marriage," *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLV (October, 1950), 691.

These include Carper and Becker,[44] Charters,[45] Getzels and Guba,[46] Gullahorn,[47] and Laulicht.[48] Others using this approach to role conflict have been Seeman,[49] Stoodley,[50] Stouffer,[51] Stutcliffe and Haberman,[52] and Ward.[53]

It was found that the major portion of attention in the literature has been given to conflicts defined at the multi-person cognitive disparity level. It is also noteworthy that no investigators have studied intra-positionally determined role conflicts (where a given position is compared on two different types of cognitions). It is reasonable to assume that there may in some cases exist cognitive disparities within positions as well as between positions.

---

[44] James W. Carper and Howard S. Becker, "Adjustments to Conflicting Expectations in the Development of Identification with an Occupation," Social Forces, XXXVI (October, 1957), 51.

[45] W. W. Charters, Jr., "A Study of Role Conflict Among Foremen in a Heavy Industry" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1952).

[46] J. W. Getzels and Egon G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, LXV (December, 1957), 423.

[47] John T. Gullahorn, "Measuring Role Conflict," American Journal of Sociology, LXI (January, 1956), 299.

[48] Jerome Laulicht, "Role Conflict: The Pattern Variable Theory and Scalogram Analysis," Social Forces, XXXIII (March, 1955), 250.

[49] Melvin Seeman, "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership," American Sociological Review, XVIII (August, 1953), 373.

[50] Bartlett Stoodley, "A Cross Cultural Study of Structure and Conflict in Social Norms," American Journal of Sociology, LXV (July, 1959), 39.

[51] Samuel A. Stouffer, "An Analysis of Conflicting Social Norms," American Sociological Review, XIV (December, 1949), 707.

[52] J. P. Stutcliffe and M. Haberman, "Factors Influencing Choice in Role Conflict Situations," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956), 695.

[53] D. S. Ward, "Conflicts Between Personal and Social Values: Significance for Public Education," Educational Research Bulletin, XXXVII (May, 1958), 125.

Hypotheses of the Study

Several general hypotheses were set up for testing in the present study. They were primarily divided into two categories: Those dealing with inter-positionally determined role conflict and those dealing with intra-positionally determined conflict. One hypothesis was concerned with both of these types of conflict.

Inter-Positional Conflict Hypotheses

> Hypothesis I - The incidence of positive norm conflict will be higher than expectational conflict.
>
> Hypothesis II - The incidence of negative norm conflict will be higher than expectational conflict.

It was assumed that the public school, as a social institution, would require, for satisfactory operation, some minimal level of agreement among people associating with it as to what its members actually do. That is, it was assumed that a minimal level of consensus on expectations for teachers would be necessary for maintenance of adequate channels of communication and interaction between various persons and teachers. This level of minimal agreement is not, however, required for norms. A certain amount of disagreement in value judgments about participants in social systems may be tolerated without disrupting the system.

> Hypothesis III - Consensus among positions on cognitions for teacher behaviors and characteristics will be positively related to the rate of interaction such positions have with each other.

This hypothesis was based on the assumption that communication between various positions is an important determinant of inter-positional cognitive consensus. The fact that certain positions are in interaction also implies that members of such positions are subject to similar patterns of communication and are likely to be similarly influenced by the school and community environment.

Intra-Positional Conflict Hypotheses

> Hypothesis IV - The incidence of normative-normative conflict will be higher than normative-expectational conflict.

This hypothesis is also based on the assumption that consensus on norms is not as important for satisfactory operation of a social system as is consensus on expectations. There is a greater possibility for flexibility in normative judgments than in expectational judgments and, therefore, a greater chance for discrepancies.

> Hypothesis V - The greater the homogeneity of positional requirements and preparation, the greater will be the intra-positional consensus on cognitions for teacher behaviors or other characteristics.

Prerequisites required for membership in some positions are more rigidly controlled than for others. It was assumed that those positions requiring long or technical training programs preceding membership would be occupied by persons more similar in viewpoint and orientation than positions where membership is decided upon randomly. It was assumed that the greater the homogeneity in the training required of position members, the more similar would be the standards on which they evaluate and view members of their own or related positions.

General Hypothesis

> Hypothesis VI - The incidence of inter-positionally determined conflict will be higher than intra-positionally determined conflict.

It was assumed that there are basic differences in the socialization prerequisites required for membership in different positions. Each position stands in a unique relationship to the teacher position and so tends to support a particular frame of reference with respect to teachers. Because the training and socialization processes differ for each position, it was expected that members of any one position would tend to agree more among themselves with respect to cognitions about teachers than with members of different positions.

CHAPTER III

THE METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

In this study of teacher role conflict, several varieties of cognitions held for the characteristics of public school teachers were measured. Members of four social positions: teachers, parents, pupils, and school officials were interviewed, and their norms and expectations for the teacher were compared to obtain role disparities. The Greater Kansas City Metropolitan Area provided the setting for the study. The methodology and design used in the study is presented in this chapter.

Sample and Population

A sample of respondents was required for the present study which would be representative of four school-related social positions in the Greater Kansas City Area. This necessitated the selection of a sample of representative schools and the selection of respondents from these schools and districts.

The Sample of Schools

The Greater Kansas City Area encompasses five counties in two states and 406 individual public schools. It was desired to sample a group of these schools from whom respondents might be selected to be interviewed. It was necessary, moreover, to assure that the sample of schools was representative of the original population. Accordingly, six characteristics were chosen about which information could be gathered for all 406 schools. These characteristics included: Type of community in which the school was located, State, County, Grade level, Number of teachers, and Number of pupils. Communities were divided arbitrarily into four types: Urban (large and well established communities with efficient means of transportation and channels of communication); Suburban (newer communities on the fringe of the urban areas); Small City (small communities located at points distant from the urban areas and maintaining independent transportation and communication facilities); and, Rural (sparsely populated areas located outside the urban, suburban or small city areas). Table 1 shows the number and percentage of schools in the total population having these characteristics.

It was arbitrarily decided that a representative sample of fifty schools would be selected from the total population of schools. Within each of the community types found in the total population, a proportionate number of schools was selected for the sample in a random fashion. The sample for each of the four types was then matched against population characteristics to insure representativeness. This was done by selecting samples at random until one was found for each community type which matched very closely the population characteristics. Table 2 shows the number and percentage of schools in the final sample having these identified characteristics. It was assumed that the final sample of fifty schools, stratified by community type and matched against the population for certain important characteristics, was representative and adequate.

The Sample of Respondents

A total sample of approximately 1,000 potential respondents was selected for the study. This number was arbitrarily chosen on the

TABLE 1

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE POPULATION BY COMMUNITY TYPE AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristics	Urban Schools (N=165)		Suburban Schools (N=107)		Small City Schools (N=39)		Rural Schools (N=95)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
STATE								
Missouri	118	71.5	48	44.8	29	74.4	52	54.0
Kansas	47	28.5	59	55.2	10	25.6	43	46.0
COUNTY								
Clay	0	0	22	20.6	8	20.5	29	30.6
Jackson	118	71.5	26	24.3	15	38.5	14	14.8
Johnson	0	0	43	40.2	6	15.4	31	32.6
Platte	0	0	0	0	6	15.4	9	9.4
Wyandotte	47	28.5	16	14.9	4	10.2	12	12.6
LEVEL								
Elementary	138	83.7	87	81.3	25	64.1	78	82.0
Junior High	11	6.6	12	11.2	6	15.4	0	0
Senior High	16	9.7	8	7.5	8	20.5	17	18.0
NUMBER OF TEACHERS								
1 - 5	8	4.9	6	5.6	2	5.2	57	60.0
6 - 10	38	23.0	14	13.0	10	25.7	21	22.1
11 - 20	61	36.9	33	30.9	13	33.3	14	14.8
21 - 50	46	27.9	48	44.9	14	35.8	3	3.1
51 and over	12	7.3	6	5.6	0	0	0	0

TABLE 1--Continued

Characteristics	Urban Schools (N=165)		Suburban Schools (N=107)		Small City Schools (N=39)		Rural Schools (N=95)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
NUMBER OF PUPILS								
1 - 50	4	2.5	0	0	0	0	41	43.2
51 - 125	3	1.8	3	2.9	2	5.1	22	23.2
126 - 300	29	17.5	17	15.9	9	23.0	23	24.2
301 - 500	43	26.0	20	18.6	13	33.4	7	7.3
501 and over	86	52.2	67	62.6	15	38.5	2	2.1

TABLE 2

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN FINAL SAMPLE BY COMMUNITY TYPE AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Urban Schools (N=165)		Suburban Schools (N=107)		Small City Schools (N=39)		Rural Schools (N=95)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
STATE								
Missouri	14	70.0	6	47.0	4	80.0	7	58.3
Kansas	6	30.0	7	53.0	1	20.0	5	41.7
COUNTY								
Clay	0	0	3	23.0	1	20.0	4	33.3
Jackson	14	70.0	3	23.0	2	40.0	2	16.7
Johnson	0	0	5	38.6	1	20.0	3	25.0
Platte	0	0	0	0	1	20.0	1	8.3
Wyandotte	6	30.0	2	15.4	0	0	2	16.7
LEVEL								
Elementary	16	80.0	11	84.6	3	60.0	10	83.3
Junior High	1	5.0	1	7.7	0	0	0	0
Secondary	3	15.0	1	7.7	2	40.0	2	16.7
NUMBER OF TEACHERS								
1 - 5	1	5.0	1	7.7	0	0	7	58.3
6 - 10	5	25.0	2	15.4	1	20.0	3	25.0
11 - 20	7	35.0	4	30.7	2	40.0	1	8.3
21 - 50	6	30.0	6	46.1	2	40.0	1	8.3
51 and over	1	5.0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 2--Continued

Characteristics	Urban Schools (N=165) n	Urban Schools (N=165) %	Suburban Schools (N=107) n	Suburban Schools (N=107) %	Small City Schools (N=39) n	Small City Schools (N=39) %	Rural Schools (N=95) n	Rural Schools (N=95) %
NUMBER OF PUPILS								
1 - 50	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	41.7
51 - 125	1	5.0	1	7.7	0	0	3	25.0
126 - 300	3	15.0	2	15.4	1	20.0	2	16.7
301 - 500	5	25.0	2	15.4	2	40.0	1	8.3
501 and over	11	55.0	8	61.5	2	40.0	1	8.3

basis of estimated expenditure of time and money. Five social positions were included in the initial sample: teachers, parents, pupils, board members and school officials (composed of principals, superintendents, and school supervisors). Ideally, positions should have been selected on a basis proportionate to their existence in the population. However, this would have resulted in too few respondents among school personnel for statistical analysis of their responses. To solve this problem, the sample size of school personnel positions was arbitrarily increased so that there would be enough respondents in each position to enable statistical comparisons.

Having decided upon the number of respondents needed in each of the five positions, the proportionate number required in each of the four community types was calculated. The one thousand potential respondents were then apportioned through the 50 sampled schools in terms of the number of teachers, parents, pupils, board members and school officials represented in each school and district. Table 3 shows the total number of position members chosen for the sample from the four community types. Respondents were chosen from the individual schools and districts by random techniques (using the school lists and a table of random numbers).

The final sample, from which data were actually collected, included 98 teachers, 261 parents, 237 public school pupils, 67 school officials, and 20 board members.[54] Table 4 shows the number of persons in each position from whom responses were obtained, by community type. Interviews were obtained from approximately 68% of potential respondents. Persons not responding may be assumed to be less motivated with regard to public education than actual respondents.

---

[54] The board member sample was sufficiently small so that no findings related to board members are reported in this dissertation.

TABLE 3

THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS, BY POSITION, CHOSEN FROM EACH OF THE FOUR COMMUNITY TYPES

Community Type	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		Board Members		School Officials	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Urban	52	48.4	195	51.9	195	51.9	5	11.1	49	50.0
Suburban	32	30.0	106	28.4	106	28.4	14	30.8	26	26.5
Small City	12	11.3	44	11.7	44	11.7	8	16.8	13	13.3
Rural	11	10.3	30	8.0	30	8.0	18	41.3	10	10.2
TOTAL:	107	100.0	375	100.0	375	100.0	45	100.0	98	100.0

TABLE 4

THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS, BY POSITION, ACTUALLY INTERVIEWED IN EACH OF THE FOUR COMMUNITY TYPES

Community Type	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		Board Members		School Officials	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Urban	46	47.0	116	44.4	106	44.7	2	10.0	28	41.8
Suburban	31	31.6	91	34.9	80	33.8	6	30.0	21	31.3
Small City	12	12.2	28	10.7	27	11.4	3	15.0	10	14.9
Rural	9	9.2	26	10.0	24	10.1	9	45.0	8	12.0
TOTAL:	98	100.0	261	100.0	237	100.0	20	100.0	67	100.0

It should be noted that the final sample does not represent a demographic sample of "the public" in the Greater Kansas City Area. Rather, it is assumed that the final sample is representative of the population of positions sampled, all of which are oriented in a particular way toward the school system.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

The Instruments

Two instruments (Form Two and Form Four) were used in the present study to collect data relevant to cognitions held for public school teachers. Both of these instruments were a part of a larger set of instruments used in conjunction with the Kansas City Teacher Role Study. Samples of these two instruments are included in Appendix A-1 and A-2.

Form Two was an open-ended instrument designed to elicit cognitions held for teacher characteristics. Questions were asked for likes (positive norms), dislikes (negative norms) and expectations regarding general teacher characteristics. No background content was provided for these questions. Respondents were simply asked to respond in terms of what they liked, disliked and expected of "public school teachers in general."

Form Four was a closed-ended instrument designed to measure cognitions held for teacher behaviors. Thirty different teacher behaviors, in a variety of background contexts, were included on this form. However, to avoid respondent fatigue, these behavioral items were broken down into three sets and each set made into a sub-form of Form Four. A given respondent received only one of the three sub-forms (Form Four-A, Four-B, or Form Four-C) to complete. Thus, only one-third of all respondents answered any given question. Careful sampling was used, however, to insure random assignment of respondents to the various forms.

Positive norms, negative norms and expectations for teacher behaviors were secured by means of Form Four. Possible responses for each item were pre-scaled in a five-point ranking. Points for the expectational scale read: 5) (Teachers do) a great deal of (the behavior involved), 4) ... a lot of ..., 3) ... a moderate amount of ..., 2) ... a slight amount of ..., and 1) ... little or no ... . Points for the negative norm and positive norm questions were identical except that respondents were asked for values. Separate ratings were given for most liked (positive norms) and least liked (negative norms) points.

The thirty items included in the various sub-forms of Form Four were selected for inclusion from a series of responses given previously by a sample of community members to an open-ended pilot study. Respondents in the pilot study were asked to give lists of physical settings appropriate for teacher entrance, social situations likely to occur within these settings, and likely teacher behaviors within these settings and situations. Pilot study responses were analyzed, and the thirty items included in Form Four were identified as widely used by community respondents. These items exhibited a variety of content and context and were felt to be fruitful for generating disparities between and within groups of respondents representing various social positions.

Data Collection

The basic method used to collect data was the group interview. Each respondent was contacted individually and asked to come to a prearranged and centrally located meeting place (usually a school in the community). Interview dates were confirmed by letter. Respondents then filled out a questionnaire under the supervision of an interviewer and his assistants. The total interview session lasted approximately two and one-half hours (including approximately one hour for Forms Two and Four). A coffee break was provided as a form of motivation.

Respondents who failed to keep their first interview appointments were contacted individually by telephone and asked to come to a second (or third) interview session at a convenient location.

Data Analysis

Teacher Characteristics

Volunteered responses giving cognitions for teacher characteristics were collected by means of Form Two. A comprehensive coding system was developed for handling responses to Form Two in an attempt to facilitate the analysis of these data with digital computers. Responses from this form were classified and coded into six general categories: Actions (verbal descriptions of teacher behavior); Manners (adverbial descriptions of teacher behavior); Imputed cognitive structures (second-order cognitions attributing other qualities to teachers); Features (enduring physical characteristics); Historical backgrounds (past experiences); and, Reactions of others to teachers. Each response was further coded for content category within this broad breakdown and for apparent point given on a five-point scale dealing with presence or high frequency of the characteristic (point one) or absence or low frequency of the characteristic (point five). Each response was given only one code. The complete list of code categories used for Form Two is given in Appendix A-5.

Two types of analysis have been used on data collected with Form Two. First, these data were analysed to discover the extent of positional differences in content area usage (ignoring point-spread). For this analysis, a series of *t* tests were run to determine whether position members used similar or different content areas to describe teacher characteristics. Separate analyses were made of responses dealing with positive norms, negative norms and expectations. This analysis was restricted, however, to content areas used frequently by the total sample. (A list of the content areas actually analyzed is given in Appendix B-1.) Statistical computations for this analysis were performed on an IBM 650 computer at Oklahoma State University.

A second type of analysis for the Form Two data was concerned with a comparison, by position, of point-spread within content areas used to describe teacher characteristics. This analysis checked, for instance, whether teachers were expected to "discipline" or "not discipline" pupils, etc. The statistic used for this analysis was the Mann-Whitney z_U, a statistic that tests the difference between two rank distributions and is comparable to the t test of difference between means. It does, however, not assume interval scale data, nor is it sensitive to non-normality of the distributions involved.[55] Statistical computations for this analysis were performed on a Burroughs Datatron at the University of Missouri.[56]

This latter analysis constituted a study of role conflicts based on discrepant cognitions held for teacher characteristics. An analysis was made of discrepancies among positions in terms of scale points given for content areas within cognition type (inter-positionally determined conflict) and also of discrepancies within positions in terms of scale points given for content areas used for more than one cognition type (intra-positionally determined conflict).

---

[55] Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956), p. 116.

[56] Bruce J. Biddle and Ann M. Simpson, A Program for the Processing of Ordinal Data and Computation of Significance for Selected Central Tendency Differences (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1961).

For all cases where negative norms were compared with other cognition types, the negative norm rank distributions were inverted. Negative norms were assumed to provide a mirror-image of other cognitions if they were not discrepant. Thus, the negative norm distributions were inverted and comparisons run to check on the validity of the mirror-image assumption. Significant differences between negative norms and other cognitions, using this approach, showed areas of potential conflict. All of the analyses for Form Two data are based on respondents who volunteered content areas (and point-spread within these content areas).

These respondents were more likely to be extreme in point of view and may not be considered random samples of the positions they represent.

Teacher Behaviors

Data relative to cognitions held for teacher behaviors were collected with Form Four. Two analyses were made of these data. First, inter-positional discrepancies in cognitions for teacher behavior were examined for the thirty items of the form. This analysis included among-position comparisons for expectations, positive norms and negative norms.

Secondly, an analysis was made of intra-positional discrepancies. That is, the scale points given by members of the same position for more than one cognition were compared. Comparisons were made of points given for expectations versus positive norms, expectations versus negative norms, and positive norms versus negative norms. In all comparisons involving negative norms versus other cognitions, the negative norm distributions were inverted.

The significance of cognitive discrepencies in Form Four data was computed by the Mann-Whitney z_U test. These calculations were made on the Burroughs Datatron at the University of Missouri.

Limitations

Several limitations of findings reported in this study should be recognized. First, the sample of respondents is not representative of the general public. Consequently, inferences regarding implications about teacher role conflict may be made only to sampled positions who are themselves concerned with public education only in specifically determined ways.

Secondly, the methodology and design of the study is limited in scope and coverage. It was assumed that respondents would be willing to give their cognitions honestly and that cognitions held for different types of behavior or teacher characteristics could be measured independently with the instruments used in the study. It was also assumed that respondents would be able to respond to the generalized referent, "teachers in general" and that this referent would not shift according to type of cognition expressed.

The coverage of content areas for teacher behaviors and characteristics has admittedly been small. It is possible that additional or different items would have resulted in different conclusions. Content areas, however, were chosen explicitely from pilot studies and represented the concerns of respondents.

Several variables bearing a potential for predicting to disparate cognitions have not been related to cognitions. Only one major independent variable was considered--social position of respondent. Other variables maintaining a potential for influence, however, were controlled for in the selection of the sample. Additional analyses, using some of these variables as predictors, might possibly add additional insights into the nature and content of teacher role conflict.

Finally, the data for this dissertation were collected in and around Kansas City and findings to be reported may be peculiar to this setting.

CHAPTER IV

THE CONTENT AREAS USED IN ASSESSING TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

Introduction

One aspect of the study was concerned with discovering what content areas were used by respondents in describing teacher characteristics. These content areas could be conceived of as the salient elements of the teacher image held by persons in the identified social positions. Data for this phase of the study were collected by Form Two (see Appendix A-1), an open-ended instrument measuring positive norms, negative norms, and expectations held for the characteristics of "teachers in general." Responses from this form were coded into numerous categories according to content areas and apparent point specified within each content scale (see Appendix A-5).

Results reported in the present chapter deal only with content area usage (ignoring point-spread) as an indication of relative importance placed on certain teacher characteristics by members of the position being studied. It was assumed that respondents would use content areas to describe teacher characteristics which were present in their cognitive structure and which were considered as salient or important.

Direct inferences about role conflict for teachers based on Form Two data are dependent on interpretation of the scaled responses. Such a point-spread analysis of these data is presented in Chapter V. Therefore, results are reported in this chapter in terms of statistically significant differences in the frequency of usage of the content areas by various positions and do not relate to specific role conflict hypotheses.

Content Areas Chosen for Study

The total number of content areas established for coding purposes included 85 actions, 64 manners, 19 imputed cognitive structures, 10 features, 21 backgrounds, and 4 reactions of others to teachers. Only those content areas reported by five per cent of the total sample of respondents (regardless of cognitive usage) were chosen for analysis of differences in positional usage. (A complete list of the 53 content areas reported by five per cent or more of all respondents is included in Appendix B-1).

Methods of Analysis

The 53 content areas chosen for study were analyzed according to cognitive use and treated statistically by means of a t test designed to determine the significance of difference between positions in percentage use of the content areas. Responses to Form Two were volunteered by respondents, and for purposes of analysis, percentages compared represent frequencies of respondents using the content areas and not the actual responses. Thus, each person using a particular content area was counted but once whether he used that content area once or more. Therefore, when applying common statistical techniques to determine significant differences in usage of content areas by various positions, frequencies for any particular content area may be considered statistically independent.

Tables 5 through 13 report actual percentage differences in positional usage for selected content areas obtained from Form Two, as well as the statistical significance of these differences. Items chosen for display were those for which it was reasonable to assume that significance of differences was not random. Seventeen out of the original 53 items chosen for study were eliminated because there were no significant differences in percentage of positional usage or because there was not more than one difference significant at $p<.05$. The decision was made to eliminate this latter group on the assumption that one out of every twenty comparisons would be significant at $p<.05$ even if only random variation was involved. Thus it would be difficult to justify interpretation of items which revealed only one difference out of eighteen comparisons at this level of confidence. The remaining 36 items were grouped into tables, broken down according to cognition type, which shared both a common pattern of differences and a common content.

The Findings

Table 5 is made up of six content areas showing positional differences for "teacher professionalism and discipline." It may be seen in this table that there is a relatively similar pattern of differences between positions for these six items. Four of the content areas are classified as actions and two are classified as manners. Major discrepancies in content area usage occur between teachers, pupils and parents. There is also a rather consistent pattern of differences between school officials, parents and pupils. For three of the content areas ("professionally," "does not discriminate," and "firmly"), most of the discrepancies stem from negative norm usage. For the remaining items, differences stem from all three types of cognitions.

Findings displayed in this table indicate that the concern of various positions with this general area of teacher characteristics shifts from content area to content area. For example, it may be noted that for the content areas, "professionally" and "disciplines," teachers have a higher frequency of usage than do parents and pupils. But for the remaining content areas where teachers differ significantly from parents and pupils, parents and pupils exhibit a higher frequency of usage. A similar distinction may be noted for school officials as contrasted with other positions. School officials use more frequently than parents or pupils the content area, "professionally," while parents and pupils, as contrasted with school officials, use more frequently the content areas, "does not discriminate," "firmly," and "enforces." Parents, as contrasted with pupils, use more frequently the content areas, "professionally," "does not discriminate," and "disciplines." Pupils, as contrasted with parents, use more frequently the content areas, "firmly," "enforces," and "permits." No disagreements may be found in this table between teachers and school officials.

TABLE 5

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE
FOR "TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM AND DISCIPLINE"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Professionally (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	17.668***	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	28.710***	24.049***
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	11.042***	19.175***
Parents - Sch.Off.	-11.372*	-19.420**	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	-30.462***	-23.440***
Content Area, Does Not Discriminate (action)			
Teachers - Parents	--	-27.622***	--

Table 5--Continued

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Teachers - Pupils	--	-11.242**	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	16.380***	--
Parents - Sch. Off.	--	31.384***	--
Pupils - Sch. Off.	--	15.004***	--
Content Area, Firmly (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	-18.760***	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	-19.149***	-18.547***	-20.588**
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	-13.131***	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	14.983**	7.061*	--
Pupils - Sch. Off.	15.372**	20.192***	20.192***
Content Area, Enforces (action)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	- 7.350***	--	- 4.567*
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	- 4.909*	--	- 4.567*
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	6.878**	--	5.115*
Content Area, Disciplines (action)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	6.702*	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	2.252*	2.252*
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Content Area, Permits (action			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	- 5.342***	- 6.279***

Table 5--Continued

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Parents - Sch. Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--

Note: For Tables 5 through 13, a negative sign in percentage difference indicates that the position listed second in the comparison exhibits the greater percentage. Differences significant at $.01 < p < .05$ are indicated with a single asterisk; at $.001 < p < .01$ with two asterisks; and, at $p < .001$ with three asterisks.

Table 6 displays significant differences in content area usage for "job-related teacher characteristics." Eight content areas are included in this category, and a consistent pattern of differences may be observed. All of the discrepancies are between teachers and school officials versus parents and pupils. No discrepancies may be found either between teachers and school officials or between parents and pupils. One of the content areas included within this table is a feature ("teacher age"). It should be noted that this is the only feature content area volunteered with high frequency by respondents. Another content area in this table is an action ("expresses satisfaction"), while the remainder are classified as manners.

Most of the content areas included in Table 6 are used more frequently by the professional groups (teachers and school officials) than by parents and pupils. Only one is used most frequently by parents and pupils ("teacher age"). It might be speculated that the more sophisticated the respondent, the less likely he is to use cognitions referring to features; indeed, the less likely he is to think about features at all. Sophisticated respondents would appear more likely to be concerned with teacher productivity and performance than with the "type" of teacher performing the job.

TABLE 6

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE FOR "JOB-RELATED TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Well-Groomed (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	9.270*	--	8.760*
Teachers - Pupils	--	11.620**	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	-11.320*	-13.496*	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	-11.914*	-18.154***	--
Content Area, Expresses Satisfaction (action)			
Teachers - Parents	--	10.189**	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	7.339*	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	-17.819***	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	-19.574***	--
Content Area, Diligently (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	13.132***	16.311***
Teachers - Pupils	--	13.845***	16.744***
Teachers - Sch. Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	-19.742***	-14.834**
Pupils - Sch. Off.	--	-20.455***	-15.267**
Content Area, Young (feature)			
Teachers - Parents	--	- 7.056***	- 5.267*
Teachers - Pupils	- 5.147**	- 4.266*	- 6.770**
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	5.819**
Pupils - Sch.Off.	4.679*	--	7.318**
Content Area, Knowledgeably (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	11.546*	--	--

2/

Table 6--*Continued*

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Teachers - Pupils	14.218**	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	-13.430*	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	-16.122**	--	--
Content Area, Personably (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	8.063*	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	-11.326*	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	-14.997**	- 7.022*	--
Content Area, Creatively (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	- 7.417*	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	- 7.193*	--	- 8.603*
Content Area, Enthusiastically (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	4.662*	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	- 7.417*	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	- 8.515*	--	- 7.193*

Table 7 includes findings for content areas dealing with "teacher ability and interest". Three of the content areas included within this table are imputed cognitive structures and one is a background. All of the significant differences found in this table stem from disagreements between pupils and the other three positions. No discrepancies occur between teachers and parents, teachers and school officials, or parents and school officials. Differences are found for all three types of cognition. It may be noted that pupils use less frequently than the other positions all of the content areas specified in this table. This, again, is reflective of a difference in the level of sophistication of various positions.

TABLE 7

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA
USAGE FOR "TEACHER ABILITY" AND "INTEREST"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Able to (imputed cognitive structure)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	11.063**	7.282*	8.831*
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	6.644***	4.119**	10.433***
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	-15.708**	-11.059**	-12.282**
Content Area, Interested in (imputed cognitive structure)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	16.003***	9.462**	14.982***
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	15.599***	9.776***	17.133***
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	-10.178*	-25.449***
Content Area, Enjoys (imputed cognitive structure)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	5.433**	--	5.763**
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	-10.788*	--	--
Content Area, Well-Educated (background)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--

Table 7--Continued

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Teachers - Pupils	6.401*	--	9.323**
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	5.930**	--	7.195***
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	-10.178*	- 6.581*	-17.[illegible]51**

Table 8 includes four items concerned with "teacher rapport and orderliness". Major discrepancies occur between pupils and teachers, parents, and school officials. Three of the content areas included are manners and one is an action. It may be seen that pupils use less frequently than school officials, parents and teachers, the content areas, "cooperates", "honestly", and "orderly". Pupils, however, use more frequently than teachers and parents the content area, "interesting". Other findings in this table indicate that school officials, more than teachers and parents, use the content areas, "cooperates" and "honestly". (This may, however, because of its rare occurrence, be only a random pattern.)

TABLE 8

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA
USAGE FOR "TEACHER RAPPORT AND ORDERLINESS"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Cooperates (action)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	14.425***	9.764**	8.442***
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	-12.184*
Parents - Pupils	9.888***	6.867***	7.488**
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	-13.158*
Pupils - Sch.Off.	-20.014***	-15.977***	-20.626***

Table 8--Continued

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Honestly (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	4.718*	--
Teachers - Pupils	4.662*	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	-11.315*
Parents - Pupils	4.175**	--	3.679*
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	- 7.078*	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	-10.007**	--	-15.096**
Content Area, Orderly (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	16.142***	8.002*	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	11.252***	--	5.043*
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	-10.695*	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	-11.131*	-12.723**	--
Content Area, Interesting (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	- 5.448*	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	- 3.252*	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--

Table 9 displays findings relevant to "teacher ethics." Three content areas are included, two of which are manners and one of which is an action. Major discrepancies are found between teachers and pupils, teachers and parents, parents and pupils, and pupils and school officials. Teachers as contrasted with parents and pupils, use more frequently the content areas "is broadminded" and "ethically." Pupils and parents, however, use more frequently than teachers the content area, "good". Parents and school officials use more frequently than pupils the content areas, "is broadminded" and "ethically", while pupils use more frequently, "good". Again, these findings are reflective both of positional relationship to the school system and level of sophistication. Pupils and parents, more frequently than other positions, have a tendency to describe teacher characteristics in terms of vague generalities (e.g., "goodness"). It may be noted that there are no significant discrepancies between teachers and school officials, or between parents and school officials.

TABLE 9

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE FOR "TEACHER ETHICS"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Is Broadminded (action)			
Teachers - Parents	8.768*	13.321**	16.155***
Teachers - Pupils	12.223**	20.944***	19.365***
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	7.623**	3.842*
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	-14.827**	-12.795*	-10.349*
Content Area, Good (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	- 8.210***
Teachers - Pupils	--	- 6.028**	-23.649***
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	-21.201***	- 6.279***	-15.439***
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	20.192***
Content Area, Ethically (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	6.491*	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	8.304**	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	4.119**	--	4.063*
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	- 8.074*	--	- 7.634*

Table 10 shows findings concerned with "reasonableness of teacher behavior." Only one item (a manner) falls within this category, and it shows a distinct pattern of differences. No significant differences stem from positive norm usage. All of the discrepancies are between teachers and parents or pupils, and parents and pupils. Parents and pupils, more frequently than teachers, use the content area, "reasonably" and pupils, more than parents, use this content area. This may be reflective of the fact that saliency of content areas is dependent in part upon the extent to which "effects" may be felt. Thus, this would be a very salient content area for pupils and parents because they are the recipients of teacher behavior.

TABLE 10

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE
FOR "REASONABLENESS OF TEACHER BEHAVIOR"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Reasonably (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	- 7.323**	- 3.595*
Teachers - Pupils	--	-18.084***	- 9.993***
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	-10.761**	- 6.398**
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--

Table 11 displays findings for four content areas related to the general area of "emotional support of pupils." Three of the content areas are manners and one is an action. The major trend indicated is the discrepancy between pupils and all other positions. Pupils, more frequently than other position members, use the content areas, "helps" and "kindly", while other positions use, "sincerely" and "lovingly." An inconsistent pattern is found for the content area, "thoughtfully", where pupils exhibit a less frequent usage than teachers, and for expectational usage, a less frequent usage than parents. But for the positive norms, pupils exhibit a more frequent usage than parents for this content area. A few differences may be observed in this table between parents and school officials also. School officials use more frequently than parents the content areas, "sincerely" and "lovingly", while on the content area, "kindly", parents exhibit a more frequent usage.

TABLE 11

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE FOR "EMOTIONAL SUPPORT OF PUPILS"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Helps (action)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	- 9.363*	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	-10.823**	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	15.714***	--	--
Content Area, Kindly (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	- 5.610*	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	- 6.615***	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	8.215*	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	8.298*	--	--
Content Area, Thoughtfully (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	9.952*	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	-21.242***	--	7.169*
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--

Table 11--Continued

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Sincerely (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	8.442**	--	9.903**
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	4.007*	4.330*	4.832**
Parents - Sch.Off.	-12.141*	--	-14.742**
Pupils - Sch.Off.	-16.148***	- 9.738*	-19.574***
Content Area, Lovingly (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	18.785***	--	9.580*
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	17.357***	--	13.889***
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	- 8.140*	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	-16.759***	- 8.715*	-12.184*

Significant differences relating to the general area of "teacher motivation and interaction" are displayed in Table 12. Three content areas are included, one of which is an imputed cognitive structure, one a manner, and one an action. Significant differences in this table stem from disagreements between teachers and all other positions. Teachers use the content area, "friendly" more than do parents and pupils, while pupils exhibit a higher usage of the content area, "discusses" than do teachers. Also, parents and school officials use the content area "motivated to" more than teachers. All of the significant differences stem from expectational usage for the content area, "motivated to" and all of the differences for the content area, "friendly" are over positive norm usage. Differences for the content area, "discusses" are both for positive norm and expectational usage.

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE FOR "TEACHER MOTIVATION AND INTERACTION"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Motivated to (imputed cognitive structure)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	- 6.636*
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	-15.793**
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Content Area, Friendly (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	10.612*	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	14.753**	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Content Area, Discusses (action)			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	- 7.211**	--	-12.195***
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--

Table 13 is composed of two items relevant to "teacher improvement and humor". Differences are found between parents and school officials or teachers, and between pupils and parents or school officials. One difference is found between teachers and school officials. Teachers and school officials, more than parents, use the content area, "improves". Teachers and pupils, more than parents and school officials, use the content area, "humorously".

TABLE 13

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE FOR "TEACHER IMPROVEMENT AND HUMOR"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Improves (action)			
Teachers - Parents	--	4.718*	8.281***
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	- 2.757*	--	-14.494**
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Content Area, Humorously (manner)			
Teachers - Parents	13.972**	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	12.078*	--	--
Parents - Pupils	-10.928**	- 4.264*	-10.635***
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	8.126*

Chapter Summary

Nine hundred and fifty-four *t* tests were run to determine the significance of difference in percentage use of 53 content areas by teachers, parents, pupils and school officials. Usage by the various positions of the content areas as expectations, positive norms and negative norms was considered. Statistical analyses indicated 206 differences significant at $p < .05$. Table 14-A summarizes comparative results in terms of significant differences among positions in usage of content areas as expectations, positive norms and negative norms.

TABLE 14-A

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE, BY POSITION, CODE DIMENSION, AND COGNITION TYPE

		Teachers				Parents				Pupils			Sch. Officials			Totals			Totals
		+H	-H	X		+H	-H	X		+H	-H	X	+H	-H	X	+H	-H	X	
Teachers	Actions															6	9	7	22
	Manners															17	14	12	43
	Imp. Cog. Str.															2	2	4	8
	Features															1	2	2	5
	Backgrounds															1	0	1	2
	Total															27	27	26	80
Parents	Actions	1	4	2	7											4	11	9	34
	Manners	5	5	4	14											22	20	16	58
	Imp. Cog. Str.	0	0	1	1											3	2	4	9
	Features	0	1	1	2											1	1	2	4
	Backgrounds	0	0	0	0											1	0	1	2
	Total	6	10	8	24											31	34	32	97
Pupils	Actions	5	5	4	14	2	5	5	12							10	14	12	36
	Manners	11	9	7	27	8	8	10	26							31	25	28	84
	Imp. Cog. Str.	2	2	2	6	3	2	3	8							7	6	7	20
	Features	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	1							4	1	2	7
	Backgrounds	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	2							3	1	3	7
	Total	20	17	15	52	15	15	19	49							55	47	52	154

Table 14-A--Continued

		Teachers				Parents				Pupils				Sch. Officials			Totals			Totals
		+N	-N	E		+N	-N	E		+N	-N	E		+N	-N	E	+N	-N	E	
School Officials	Actions	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	5	3	4	3	10				4	6	6	16
	Manners	1	0	1	2	9	7	2	18	12	8	11	31				22	15	15	51
	Imp. Cog. Str.	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6				2	2	3	7
	Postures	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	3				2	0	2	4
	Backgrounds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3				1	1	1	3
	Total	1	0	3	4	10	9	5	24	20	15	18	53				31	24	27	81

Note: In this table, +N refers to Positive Norm; -N refers to Negative Norm; and E refers to Expectation.

Table 14-B shows grand totals for significant differences by cognition type and code category dimension.

TABLE 14-B

GRAND TOTALS FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE BY CODE DIMENSION AND COGNITION TYPE

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Total
Actions	12	20	17	49
Manners	46	37	35	118
Imputed Cognitive Structures	7	6	9	22
Features	4	2	4	10
Backgrounds	3	1	3	7
Total	72	66	68	206

Several noticeable trends are evident in these two summary tables. First, it should be noted that there is an overall pattern of consistency in the number of significant differences by positional comparison across cognition type. That is, the number of significant differences in percentage use of content areas is approximately the same for all three cognition types for any positional comparison. This indicates general consistency in the way members of any given position describe teacher characteristics--and this pattern is but little influenced by cognitive frame of reference.

The majority of significant differences (for all three types of cognitions) involve pupils versus adult respondents. This finding is perhaps reflective of a differential in the types of interactions the respondents have had with teachers as a basis for their cognitions. It is also suggestive of a difference in level of sophistication. A second major classification of significant differences is the parent-professional interest group comparison. This finding is perhaps also reflective of differences in the types of relationships the respondents have had with teachers. Parents represent a lay point of view versus the professional point of view shared by teachers and school officials--perhaps because of similar socialization processes required for membership in their positions. This is borne out by the fact that teachers and school officials are involved, when compared one against the other, in only four significant differences.

Figure 1 summarizes content areas used predominantly by the various positions for the three cognition types.

Several interesting patterns may be observed in Figure 1. First, it will be noted that there is overall similarity in the content areas used predominantly by teachers, parents and school officials, with the greatest similarity being between teachers and school officials (the professional interest groups). It may also be observed that the pupil respondents are rather unique in terms of content area usage. The content areas conceptualized and expressed by pupils are, for the most part, at a relatively low level of sophistication. Content areas used by pupils are related, on the one hand to the issue of pupil freedom, and on the other, to a very vague set of 'all-American ethics' for teachers. Adults, especially teachers and school officials, are concerned with teacher ability and specific levels of interactional performance, and display a much wider variety of content areas. Finally, it will be noted that there is a great deal of interdependence in the usage of content areas by all positions across cognition type.

FIGURE 1

PREDOMINANT POSITIONAL USAGE OF CONTENT AREAS, BY COGNITION TYPE

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Teachers	Able to Cooperates Enthusiastically Friendly Honestly Humorously Interested in Is broadminded Knowledgeably Lovingly Orderly Personably Sincerely Thoughtfully Well educated Well groomed	Able to Cooperates Diligently Disciplines Ethically Expresses satisfaction Honestly Improves Is broadminded Orderly Professionally Well groomed	Able to Diligently Improves Interested in Is broadminded Lovingly Professionally Sincerely Well educated Well groomed
School Officials	Able to Cooperates Creatively Enjoys Enthusiastically Ethically Honestly Improves Is broadminded Knowledgeably Lovingly Orderly Personably Professionally Sincerely Well educated Well groomed	Able to Cooperates Diligently Expresses satisfaction Honestly Interested in Is broadminded Lovingly Orderly Personably Professionally Sincerely Well educated Well groomed	Able to Cooperates Creatively Diligently Enthusiastically Ethically Honestly Improves Interested in Is broadminded Lovingly Motivated to Professionally Sincerely Well Educated

Figure 1--Continued

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Parents	Able to Cooperates Enjoys Ethically Firmly Honestly Interested in Kindly Lovingly Orderly Well educated	Able to Cooperates Disciplines Does not discriminate Interested in Sincerely Young	Able to Disciplines Enjoys Ethically Honestly Interested in Lovingly Motivated to Orderly Professionally Thoughtfully Well educated Young
Pupils	Discusses Enforces Firmly Good Helps Humorously Interesting Kindly Young	Firmly Good Humorously Interesting Kindly Permits Young	Discusses Enforces Firmly Good Humorously Permits Young

CHAPTER V

ROLE CONFLICT BASED ON SCALED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

Introduction

One of the major concerns of the present research was to study teacher role conflicts based on discrepancies in cognitions held by members of various positions for teacher characteristics. Results reported in this chapter concern discrepancies based upon the apparent scale point value of responses volunteered by respondents for teacher characteristics. The content areas used for this analysis are the 53 which were used by five per cent or more of all respondents on Form Two (see Appendix B-1). Data presented in Chapter IV were also based on these 53 content areas, but results there were reported only in terms of content area names.

Content areas were given by respondents on Form Two as expectations, positive norms and negative norms. These content areas were coded according to dimension emphasized and for apparent point given within each content area. Points ranged from one (presence or high frequency of the content area) to five (absence or low frequency of the content area).

The incidence of teacher role conflict based on Form Two scaled data was determined in two ways. First, an analysis was made of discrepancies among positions in terms of scale points given for content areas within cognition type (inter-positionally determined conflict). Secondly, an analysis was made of discrepancies within positions in terms of scale points given for content areas used for more than one cognition type (intra-positionally determined conflict).

Throughout this chapter, significance of cognitive discrepancies was computed utilizing the Mann-Whitney z_U. All statistical comparisons are two-tailed tests.

Inter-Positionally Determined Conflict

The identification of inter-positionally determined conflict is based on among-position, within-cognition analyses. Thus, for any given content area, there may be disagreements on scaled points among the four positions (teachers, parents, pupils, and school officials) in terms of expectations, positive norms, or negative norms. It must be noted, however, that responses to questions on Form Two were given voluntarily, which suggests that the respondents who chose to report any particular content area may have held extreme points of view.

Expectational conflicts over teacher characteristics arise when two positions disagree on point usage within a content area used voluntarily as an expectation. This is to say that one of the positions would expect the presence (or high frequency) of this characteristic, while another position would expect the absence (or low frequency) of this same characteristic. For positive norm conflicts, members of one position would like the presence (or high frequency) of a characteristic and members of another position would like the absence (or low frequency) of the characteristic. Negative norm conflicts stem similarly from disagreements among positions on a question of whether the presence or absence of a given characteristic is undesirable.

Table 15 displays statistically significant differences of central tendency for the inter-positionally determined conflict analysis. (Basic data tables, showing all positional mean scores for the selected 33 content areas, are included in Appendixes B-5, B-6, and B-7.)

TABLE 15

INTER-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS, BY POSITIONAL COMPARISON CONTENT AREA, AND COGNITION TYPE

Positional Comparison	Content Area	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Teachers - Parents	ACTION CONTENT AREAS			
	Cooperates	--	--	- .879*
	Does not discriminate	1.334*	--	--
	BETWEEN COGNITIVE STRUCTURES			
	Interested in	--	- .182*	--
Teachers - Pupils	ACTION CONTENT AREAS			
	Does not discriminate	1.359*	--	--
	MANNER CONTENT AREAS			
	Firmly	-1.063*	--	--
Parents - Pupils	ACTION CONTENT AREAS			
	Controls others	--	--	1.861*
	Controls self	--	--	-1.5[illegible]2*
	Discusses	--	--	2.071**
	MANNER CONTENT AREAS			
	Firmly	- .951***	1.179**	--
	Kindly	--	--	- .654*
	Pleasantly	- .192*	--	--
	Well groomed	--	.154*	--

Table 15--Continued

Positional Comparison	Content Area	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Parents - School Officials	ACTION CONTENT AREAS			
	Cooperates	--	--	.608*
	MANNER CONTENT AREAS			
	Ethically	--	--	-1.333*
	Kindly	--	--	-1.000*
	BACKGROUNDS			
	Community-Civic Participation	--	--	-1.100
Pupils - School Officials	ACTION CONTENT AREAS			
	Controls self	--	--	2.417*
	MANNER CONTENT AREAS			
	Firmly	1.065**	--	--
	Kindly	--	1.333**	--

Note: For Table 15, a negative sign in mean difference indicates that the position listed second in the comparison has the greater mean score. (A low mean score is indicative of a concern for the presence or high frequency of the content area.) For Tables 13 through 19, differences significant at .01<p<.05 are indicated with a single asterisk, at .001<p<.01 with two asterisks, and at p<.001 with three asterisks.

It must be noted that only random significance was found in this analysis. That is, 954 comparisons were made and only twenty were found to be significant at $p < .05$. Forty-eight would be expected by chance alone at this level of confidence. As a result of this, no additional discussion of these findings will be given at this time. (See Chapter VII).

Intra-Positionally Determined Conflict

The identification of intra-positionally determined conflict is based on within-position, among-cognition analyses. That is, each position is compared for its scale point usage on content areas expressed for different cognition types. Thus, members of any position may differ among themselves on scale points within content areas used as expectations and positive norms, expectations and negative norms, or positive norms and negative norms.

Mean score differences from the intra-positionally determined conflict analysis are displayed in Tables 16 through 19. Only findings which are statistically significant are reported. (Basic data tables, showing all mean scores, are included in Appendixes B-5, B-6, and B-7.) Comparisons made between negative norms and the other two types of cognitions involved an inversion of the negative norm distribution. It was assumed that consonance between positive norms and expectations would be "normal" and that negative norms should ordinarily be disparate from both expectations and positive norms. As a result, negative norms were inverted to check on this "mirror-image" assumption. Each table presents cognitive disparities for a given position, broken down according to type of disparity and content areas involved.

Table 16 displays intra-positionally determined conflicts based on discrepancies within the teacher position.

TABLE 16

INTRA-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS BASED ON COGNITIVE DISCREPANCIES AMONG TEACHERS

Content	Expectation-Positive Norm	Expectation-Negative Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
ACTION CONTENT AREAS			
Is broadminded	1.636**	1.525***	--
Controls others	2.250*	--	--
Controls self	--	2.333*	--
Does not discriminate	--	--	1.667**
Disciplines	--	3.000*	--
Expresses satisfaction	--	3.800**	--
MANNER CONTENT AREAS			
Diligently	--	.737*	--
Friendly	--	--	- .571*
Personably	1.167*	--	--
Professionally	1.667**	1.598**	--
Well groomed	1.000**	1.000**	--
IMPUTED COGNITIVE STRUCTURES			
Able to	1.455**	--	--

Table 16--Continued

Content	Expectation-Positive Norm	Expectation-Negative Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
BACKGROUNDS			
Well educated	1.800*	--	--

Note: For Tables 16 through 19, a negative sign in mean difference indicates that the mean score for the cognition listed second in the comparison is greatest. (A low mean score for all cognitions except inverted negative norms is indicative of a concern for the presence or high frequency of the content area. For negative norms a low mean score is indicative of a concern for the absence or low frequency of the content area.)

Several interesting findings may be seen in Table 16. Teachers, as a group of respondents, exhibit seven cognitive discrepancies over content areas used as expectations and positive norms. Teachers feel that teachers should be broadminded, control others, be personable and professional, be well groomed, have ability and be well educated. In all cases with respect to these content areas, however, teachers do not expect teachers to have these characteristics to the degree desired. This finding indicates that idealized cognitions about the public school teacher (on certain content areas) do not coincide with reality cognitions about this particular role as expressed by teachers themselves.

Seven cognitive discrepancies were found when contrasting usage of content areas as expectations and negative norms. For all of these comparisons, the rank distributions for the negative norms have been inverted. Statistical significance derived from comparing non-inverted negative norms and expectations would not imply conflict for teachers. That is, if the presence of a content area is expected and the absence is disliked, this would be no problem for the teacher. Therefore, all of the negative norm rank distributions have been inverted so that any statistically significant differences found are indicative of potential conflict. All of the expectation-negative norm comparisons included in Table 16 may be interpreted as meaning that the absence of certain content areas is disliked and teachers are expected not to have (or exhibit these characteristics. Thus, teachers dislike teachers to not be broadminded, not discipline pupils, not express satisfaction, not control themselves, not be diligent, professional or well groomed. But the presence of these characteristics is not expected of teachers--and this difference between what is expected and what is disliked is statistically significant.

Only two items ("does not discriminate," and "friendly") resulted in positive norm-negative norm cognitive discrepancies within the teacher position. Here, as in the case of the expectation-negative norm comparisons, the rank distributions for negative norms have been inverted so that statistically significant findings are indicative of role conflict for teachers. It was found that teachers, as a group of respondents, dislike teacher discrimination (as indicated by negative norm usage) but (for positive norm usage) do not like the absence of this characteristic as strongly. For the content area, *friendly*, a slightly different type of discrepancy is found. Teachers like teachers to be *friendly*, but do not dislike the absence of this characteristic as strongly.

Of the 16 cognitive discrepancies reported in Table 16, seven were based on content areas classified as actions, seven were based on manners, one was based on an *imputed* cognitive structure, and one based on a background. It may also be noted that several of the content areas involved in expectation-negative norm discrepancies were also involved in expectation-positive norm discrepancies. There were, however, no overlaps between the expectation-normative comparisons and the normative-normative analysis.

Results from the intra-positionally determined conflict analysis based on parents as a respondent group are presented in Table 17. Twenty-two conflicts stem from expectation-positive norm disparities. For all of the content areas involved in this type of comparison, parents like the presence of the characteristic but do not expect to find it in teachers. Again, this is reflective of a discrepancy between idealized cognitions held by parents for teachers and reality cognitions. Six of the content areas involved are classified as actions, twelve are

TABLE 17

INTRA-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS BASED ON COGNITIVE DISCREPANCIES AMONG PARENTS

Content	Expectation-Positive Norm	Expectation-Negative Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
ACTION CONTENT AREAS			
Is broadminded	1.722**	1.722***	--
Controls others	2.111***	1.911**	--
Cooperates	.873***	.873**	--
Controls self	--	.833*	--
Discusses	2.571**	--	- .909*
Does not discriminate	2.867**	3.121***	--
Expresses satisfaction	--	3.000**	--
Helps	.321*	--	--
MANNER CONTENT AREAS			
Creatively	--	2.123*	--
Ethically	1.120***	--	--
Fairly	.886**	1.120***	--
Firmly	--	--	-1.080**
Friendly	.308**	--	- .100*
Happily	2.200**	2.400***	--
Lovingly	.294**	--	--
Patiently	1.007***	.814*	--
Personably	.769**	--	- .230*
Professionally	1.961***	1.961***	--
Reasonably	2.267*	2.667***	--
Sincerely	.873*	--	--
Thoughtfully	.479***	.637*	--
Well groomed	.824**	.824**	--

TABLE 17--*Continued*

Content	Expectation-Positive Norm	Expectation-Negative Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
FEATURES:			
Pleasant voice	.000*	--	--
[illegible]			
Able to	.465*	.083*	--
Interested in	.727***	.727**	--
BACKGROUND:			
Well educated	.010*	--	--

manners, two are imputed cognitive structures, one is a feature, and one is a background.

Sixteen conflicts stem from expectation-negative norm disparities. All of the negative norm distributions have been inverted. For all of the content areas involved in this type of comparison, parents dislike the absence of the implied characteristics but do not expect to find it in teachers. Six of the sixteen statistically significant disparities are based on action content areas, eight are based on manners, and two are based on imputed cognitive structures.

Four disparities were found in the positive norm-negative norm comparison (where negative norms were inverted), one of which was based on an action content area and three of which were based on manner content areas. For all of these content areas, the presence of the implied characteristics is approved by parents and the absence of the characteristics is not disapproved.

Table 10 displays significant results from the intra-positionally determined conflict analysis based on discrepancies within the pupil position. There were eighteen expectation-positive norm disparities, seven of which were based on content areas classified as actions and eleven of which were based on manners. All of these discrepancies stem from the fact that teachers are not expected by pupils to have certain characteristics to the desired extent.

Thirteen cognitive disparities were found to stem from the expectation-negative norm comparison. Four of these disparities were based on content areas classified as actions, eight were based on manners and one was based on a feature. On all of these content areas, the conflict stems from the fact that pupils dislike the absence of a certain characteristic in teachers, and this characteristic is not expected in

TABLE 10

INTRA-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS BASED ON COGNITIVE DISCREPANCIES AMONG PUPILS

Content	Expectation-Positive Norm	Expectation-Negative Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
ACTION CONTENT AREAS			
Is businesslike	2.057**	2.057**	--
Controls self	2.167**	2.417***	.250*
Discusses	.500*	--	- .093*
Does not discriminate	2.038**	2.260***	--
Enforces	.867*	--	-1.810**
Expresses satisfaction	--	3.333*	--
Helps	.104***	--	- .444*
Punishes	1.130**	--	- .480*
MANNER CONTENT AREAS			
Democratically	2.379*	2.379*	--
Fairly	1.309**	1.213**	--
Firmly	--	1.411***	-1.310**
Friendly	.326*	--	--
Good	.391***	--	--
Happily	1.400*	1.360**	--
Humorously	.730***	.813*	--
Interesting	1.714**	1.714*	--
Kindly	--	.636*	--
Patiently	.763*	--	--
Reasonably	.056**	2.000***	--
Thoughtfully	.300*	--	--
Well groomed	.400*	--	--
FEATURES			
Young	--	1.617**	1.390**

teachers. (All negative norms have been inverted.)

There were seven positive norm-negative norm disparities, five of which were based on actions, one on a manner and one on a feature. For this comparison, also, the negative norms have been inverted. It may be seen that for all content areas with the exception of, 'controls self' and 'young', significant differences stem from the fact that pupils like the presence of the implied characteristics but do not dislike the absence of the characteristics. Regarding the content areas, "controls self' and 'young', pupils dislike the absence of these qualities, but are not desirous of their presence.

Three cognitive discrepancies were found in the analysis of cognitions given by school officials. These are shown in Table 19. Once again, these few significant differences might have appeared by chance alone and are not further interpreted.

Chapter Summary

Results reported in this chapter have been based on statistical analyses of apparent scale points given by position respondents for content areas descriptive of teacher characteristics. Analyses have been made of discrepancies in scale points given within cognition type for content areas by members of different positions (inter-positional analysis) and also of discrepancies within given positions in scale points given for content areas used as more than one cognition type (intra-positional analysis).

Nine hundred and fifty-four inter-positional comparisons were made and twenty statistically significant disparities were found. It was suggested, however, that this small a number of significant items might possibly have occurred by chance alone. For the intra-positional analyses, a total of 139 comparisons were made for each of the four positions. For

TABLE 19

INTRA-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS BASED ON COGNITIVE DISCREPANCIES AMONG SCHOOL OFFICIALS

Content	Expectation-Positive Norm	Expectation-Negative Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
[illegible]			
Is [illegible]	3.111*	2.034*	--
Well groomed	.909*	--	--

all positions with the exception of school officials, more than random variation was found. Table 20 shows the number of significant intra-positional disparities which were found, organized by position and type of cognitive comparison.

TABLE 20

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT INTRA-POSITIONAL DISPARITIES
BY POSITIONS AND TYPE OF COGNITIVE COMPARISONS

Position	Exp.-P. Norm	Exp.-N. Norm	P.Norm-N.Norm	Totals
Teachers	7	7	2	16
Parents	22	16	4	42
Pupils	18	13	7	38
School Officials	Random Significance Only			
Totals	47	36	13	96

It may be observed that most of the intra-positional disparities occur when contrasting positional usage of content areas as expectations and positive norms. This trend holds for all positions. This indicates an overall discrepancy between idealized cognitions held for certain teacher characteristics and the reality cognitions held for these same characteristics. Also, a relatively large proportion of the disparities stem from the expectational-inverted negative norm comparisons. This seems to indicate that there is considerable consonance between what various position members dislike and expect to find by way of teacher characteristics. Very few significant disparities are found when contrasting positional usage of content areas as positive norms and negative norms (inverted).

Most of the significant intra-positional disparities occur within the parent and pupil positions. Teachers exhibit relatively few significant disparities, while school officials exhibit only random variation.

Certain patterns of differences are found when comparing the number of disparities for the various content area dimensions. Table 21 shows the number of significant intra-positional disparities found for each position according to content area dimension.

TABLE 21

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT INTRA-POSITIONAL DISPARITIES BY POSITION AND CONTENT AREA DIMENSION

Position	Actions	Manners	Features	Imputed Cognitive Structures	Back-grounds	Totals
Teachers	7	7	0	1	1	16
Parents	13	23	1	4	1	42
Pupils	16	20	2	0	0	38
School Officials	Random Significance Only					
Totals	36	50	3	5	2	96

Table 21 indicates that teachers exhibit the same number of significant disparities over content areas classified as actions and those classified as manners. However, both parents and pupils exhibit more disparities over manners. Generally speaking, the action categories are more specific in nature than the manner categories. The findings indicated in Table 21 may suggest that parents and pupils have a tendency to speak in generalities about teacher characteristics, while teachers themselves, having been professionally socialized, are more concerned with specific aspects of the teacher role. Overall, content areas classified as features, imputed cognitive structures, or backgrounds occur rarely in intra-positional discrepancies.

Certain content areas were involved uniquely in some of the positional disparities. A list of these content areas, categorised by position and type of cognitive disparity, is presented in Figure 2. It may be seen that only three content areas are unique to cognitive disparities among teachers, while a much larger number is unique to parents and pupils. Generally, the content areas disagreed upon uniquely by parents and by pupils are concerned with the issue of emotional support of pupils and have a tendency to be more general than those unique to teachers. Parents and pupils disagree among themselves on approximately the same number of unique content areas for both the expectation-positive norm, and expectation-negative norm comparisons, while teachers do not disagree among themselves on any unique content areas for the expectation-positive norm comparison.

Four different content areas were found to be commonly involved in intra-positional disparities for teachers, parents and pupils. These content areas, organised according to type of cognitive disparity, are displayed in Figure 3.

It might be suggested that the content areas included in Figure 3 represent especial areas of general concern and controversy on the part of respondents. It should be noted that there are no common content areas involved in positive norm-negative norm disparities. Overall, there are considerably more content areas uniquely than commonly involved in intra-positional disparities for the various positions.

Figure 2

CONTENT AREAS INVOLVED UNIQUELY IN POSITIONAL COGNITIVE DISPARITIES

Inter-Positional Comparisons		Intra-Positional Comparisons		
Position		Expectation-Pos. Norm	Expectation-Neg. Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
Teachers			Disciplines Diligently	Does not discriminate
Parents	Random Significance Only	Cooperates Ethically Lovingly Professionally Sincerely Pleasant voice Interested in	Cooperates Creatively Controls others Patiently Professionally Thoughtfully Able to Interested in	Creatively Personably
Pupils		Controls self Enforces Permits Democratically Good Humorously Interesting	Democratically Firmly Humorously Interesting Kindly Young	Controls self Helps Permits Young
School Officials		Random Significance Only		

Figure 3

CONTENT AREAS COMMON TO TEACHERS, PARENTS,
AND PUPILS FOR INTRA-POSITIONAL DISPARITIES

Expectation-Pos. Norm	Expectation-Neg. Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
Is broadminded	Is broadminded	
Well groomed	Controls self	
	Expresses satisfaction	

Specific hypotheses relating to results reported in this chapter are discussed, and implications of the findings explored, in Chapter VII.

CHAPTER VI

ROLE CONFLICT BASED ON SCALED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER BEHAVIORS

Introduction

Another aspect of the present research was to study teacher role conflicts based on discrepancies in cognitions held by members of various positions for teacher behaviors. Data for this analysis were collected with Form Four (see Appendixes A-2, A-3, and A-4), a closed-ended instrument dealing with teacher behaviors in a variety of setting and social situation contexts. Positive norms, negative norms, and expectations for teacher behaviors were secured on this form, with possible responses for each type of cognition being pre-scaled on a five-point continuum dealing with frequency of occurrence of the behavior involved. Thirty differing teacher behaviors were included in Form Four. These behaviors were broken down into three sets and each set made into a sub-form of Form Four. Each respondent received only one sub-form to complete.

Findings reported in this chapter concern both inter-positional and intra-positional cognitive discrepancies. The significance of cognitive discrepancies was computed by the Mann-Whitney z_U, with all statistical tests being two-tailed.

Inter-Positionally Determined Conflict

The determination of inter-positionally determined conflict is based on among-position, within-cognition analyses. For any given teacher behavior, there may be disagreements on scaled points among the four positions (teachers, parents, pupils, and school officials) in terms of expectations, positive norms, or negative norms. All inter-positional cognitive disparities based on Form Four data are indicative of positional differences in opinion regarding the frequency with which teachers perform certain behaviors (expectational disparities), should perform certain behaviors (positive norm disparities), or should not perform certain behaviors (negative norm disparities).

Data showing significant inter-positional mean differences in cognitions for teacher behaviors are presented in Tables 22 through 27. These tables contain items sharing a common content and a common pattern of differences and are organized to show positional comparisons and types of cognitive discrepancies. Only items for which more than random significance was found are included. (Basic data tables, showing all positional mean scores for the thirty items in Form Four, are included in Appendixes B-8, B-9, and B-10.)

Table 22 displays significant inter-positional disparities for behavioral items dealing generally with "maintenance of order". Six different behavioral items are included in this table, with the majority of significant discrepancies occurring for positive norms. Major discrepancies for all cognitions are between parents versus pupils or teachers.

For positive norms, findings reported in this table indicate that parents more than teachers and pupils, approve of the maintenance of order. This trend holds, even for one item implying the lack of order maintenance. Teachers and pupils, more than parents, approve of "ignoring pupils misbehaving in the classroom". Other positive norm discrepancies indicate that parents also approve of order maintenance more than school officials ("policing the halls," and "disciplining pupils in the cafeteria'). One significant positive norm discrepancy was found when comparing teachers against school officials. School officials approve of more supervising on the playground than do teachers.

Findings for negative norms are consistent with those for positive norms. Pupils dislike maintenance of order more than parents, teachers, and school officials. Teachers dislike this activity more than do parents. For expectations, parents are found to expect more maintenance of order by teachers than either teachers or pupils.

TABLE 22

SIGNIFICANT INTER-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS
FOR "MAINTENANCE OF ORDER"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Behavior Item. Watching pupils during study period			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	- .963***	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Behavior Item. Ignoring pupils misbehaving in a classroom			
Teachers - Parents	.493**	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	- .820**	.904***	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Behavior Item. Keeping pupils quiet in the library			
Teachers - Parents	- .327**	--	- .417**
Teachers - Pupils	--	- .467*	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	.504**	- .648***	.406**
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch. Off.	--	.645*	--

TABLE 23--*Continued*

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Behavior Item. Policing the halls			
Teachers - Parents	- .911***	1.272***	- .673**
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	.731**	-1.361***	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	.661*	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	1.003*	--
Behavior Item. Supervising on the playground			
Teachers - Parents	- .862***	.883***	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	- .679*	--	--
Parents - Pupils	.807**	-1.130***	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	- .780**	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Behavior Item. Disciplining pupils in the cafeteria			
Teachers - Parents	-1.103***	--	- .812*
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	.744*	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--

Note: For Tables 21 through 27, a negative sign in mean difference indicates that the position listed second in the comparison has the greater mean score. (A high mean score is indicative of a concern for the high frequency of the behavioral item.) For Tables 22 through 31, differences significant at .01<p<.05 are indicated with a single asterisk, at .001<p<.01 with two asterisks, and at p<.001, with three asterisks.

Table 23 displays significant results for "deviancy control". A consistent pattern of differences may be observed for the three behavioral items included in this table, with major discrepancies occurring between parents and pupils versus teachers and school officials. *Findings* for positive norms indicate that parents and pupils, more than teachers and school officials, approve of deviancy control. The negative norm findings are compatible and show that teachers, more than parents and pupils, dislike deviancy control. School officials, more than parents, disapprove of telling misbehaving pupils in the classroom to stop talking. Expectational comparisons indicate that parents and pupils expect to find more deviancy control by teachers than do teachers and school officials.

TABLE 23

SIGNIFICANT INTER-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS
FOR DEVIANCY CONTROL

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Behavior Item. Watching for cheaters during a classroom test			
Teachers - Parents	--	.930*	--
Teachers - Pupils	- .606*	1.173**	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	.764*	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	1.048**	--	--
Behavior Item. Telling misbehaving pupils in the classroom to stop talking			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	- .563*
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	.717*	-1.095*	.704*
Pupils - Sch.Off.	.701*	--	.974**
Behavior Item. Threatening pupils misbehaving in the classroom			
Teachers - Parents	- .830*	1.442**	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	1.055*	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	1.380**	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	1.032*	--	--

Findings relative to a series of behavioral items concerned with "teacher self-indulgence" are displayed in Table 24. Most of the discrepancies stem from disagreements between parents and pupils versus teachers and school officials. Positive norm comparisons indicate that parents and pupils, more than teachers and school officials, approve of teacher self-indulgence. Pupils, more than parents, approve also of teacher self-indulgence. Compatible findings may be observed for negative norms, where teachers, and to some extent, school officials, dislike teacher self-indulgence more than do parents and pupils. Parents and pupils also expect more self-indulgence than do teachers and school officials.

TABLE 24

SIGNIFICANT INTER-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS
FOR "TEACHER SELF-INDULGENCE"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Behavior Item. Reading own books during study period			
Teachers - Parents	- .770*	--	-1.127**
Teachers - Pupils	-1.600***	1.450*	-1.507***
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	- .628*	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	.730*	-1.310*	.947**
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	.916**
Behavior Item. Doing own studying and grading in the library			
Teachers - Parents	--	1.072*	- .623*
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	- .614*
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	- .628*	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	.730*	-1.310*	.947**
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	.936**
Behavior Item. Grading papers during a classroom singing period			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	- .873*

TABLE 24--*Continued*

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Teachers - Pupils	- .940**	1.340*	-1.127*
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	1.083*	--	1.210*
Behavior Item. Visiting with other teachers during study period			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	- .504*	--	- .667***
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	.377*	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	.600*	--	--
Behavior Item. Visiting with other teachers on the playground			
Teachers - Parents	- .461*	--	- .467**
Teachers - Pupils	--	1.164**	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	.872**	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	-1.595**	--
Behavior Item. Singing during a classroom singing period			
Teachers - Parents	--	.760*	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	- .724**	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Behavior Item. Leaving the room during a classroom test			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	- .731*	--	- .461*
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	- .495*	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--

Table 25 displays significant inter-positional disparities for 'community participation'. Major discrepancies stem from disagreements between teachers versus parents, pupils, and school officials. Parents, pupils, and school officials, for positive norms, approve of more community participation by teachers than do teachers. And pupils approve of this activity for teachers more than do parents. For negative norms, the findings are consistent with this pattern. Teachers, more than parents and pupils, disapprove of community participation. Parents disapprove of community participation more than do pupils. Expectational findings indicate that parents, pupils, and school officials expect more community participation by teachers than do teachers. And parents expect more of this activity than do school officials.

TABLE 25

SIGNIFICANT INTER-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS
FOR 'COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION'

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Behavior Item, Speaking out at PTA meetings in the auditorium			
Teachers - Parents	- .798***	1.376***	- 1.263***
Teachers - Pupils	- .732**	1.086*	- 1.120***
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	- .739**
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	.526*
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Behavior Item, Attending PTA meetings in the auditorium			
Teachers - Parents	- .480*	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	- .859***	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	- .856**	--	--
Parents - Pupils	- .379**	- .241*	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--

TABLE 25--Continued

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Behavior Item, Visiting with parents during PTA meetings in the auditorium			
Teachers - Parents	--	1.223*	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	- 1.342*	1.857*	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	- .674*
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Behavior Item, Participating in community activities out of school			
Teachers - Parents	--	1.126*	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	- .778**	--	- .550*
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--

Results for two behavioral items concerned with 'teacher cooperation' are included in Table 26. Teachers approve of more cooperation than do pupils. The greatest number of significant discrepancies occur for negative norms, where it may be observed that pupils, more than teachers, parents and school officials, dislike teacher cooperation. For expectations, it may be seen that teachers, in contrast to pupils and school officials, expect more teacher cooperation.

TABLE 26

SIGNIFICANT INTER-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS
FOR 'TEACHER COOPERATION'

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Behavior Item, Cooperating with other teachers in the school			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	- .339*	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--

TABLE 26--Continued

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Parents - Pupils	--	- .271*	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Behavior Item, Cooperating with the principal in school			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	.558**	- .672*	.387**
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	.278*
Parents - Pupils	--	- .990***	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	.898*	--

Table 27 is composed of five behavioral items which share neither a common pattern of differences nor a commonality of content. Differences for each of these items are somewhat unique. For the item, "supervising pupils in a classroom test," parents show more approval than pupils. Other findings for this item indicate that pupils dislike more and do not expect this activity as much as do teachers, parents, and school officials.

For the item, "disciplining pupils during basketball game in the gym," parents and pupils approve and expect to find this activity more than do teachers. Pupils approve more of this behavior than do school officials. Teachers and pupils exhibit greater disapproval of this activity than do parents.

For the behavioral item, "having pupils sing solos during a classroom singing period," teachers show greater disapproval than do pupils, and parents expect to find this activity more frequently than do pupils.

Findings for the item, "allowing pupils to explore during experiments in the laboratory," indicate that pupils and school officials exhibit more approval than teachers. Also, pupils exhibit more approval than parents. For negative norms, it may be seen that teachers disapprove of this activity more than do parents. School officials expect more of this particular behavior on the part of teachers than do teachers themselves.

For the item, "doing menial tasks during basketball games in the gym", major disagreements are between teachers and all other positions. Pupils approve of the performance of menial tasks more than do teachers. Teachers, as shown by negative norm comparisons, disapprove of menial task performance more than do parents, pupils and school officials. No significant discrepancies are found in expectations for this behavioral item.

TABLE 27

SIGNIFICANT INTER-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS
FOR "MISCELLANEOUS BEHAVIOR ITEMS"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Behavior Item. Supervising pupils in a classroom test			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	- .984**	.688*
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	.613*	- .926***	.688**
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	1.149**	-1.155**
Behavior Item. Disciplining pupils during basketball game in the gym			
Teachers - Parents	- .576*	1.133**	- .576*
Teachers - Pupils	- .851**	--	- .917***
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	- .760*	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	.620*	--	--

Table 27--Continued

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Behavior Item, Having pupils sing solos during a classroom singing period			
Teachers - Parents	--	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	.814*	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	.337*
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Behavior Item, Allowing pupils to explore during experiments in the laboratory			
Teachers - Parents	--	.675*	--
Teachers - Pupils	- .696**	--	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	- .682*	--	- .744*
Parents - Pupils	- .533**	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Behavior Item, Doing menial tasks during basketball game in the gym			
Teachers - Parents	--	.931*	--
Teachers - Pupils	- .912*	1.568**	--
Teachers - Sch.Off.	--	.429*	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch.Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch.Off.	--	--	--

Intra-Positionally Determined Conflict

The determination of intra-positionally determined conflict is based on within-position, among-cognition analyses. Each of the four positions is compared in terms of scale points given for different cognitions for the same behavior. Conflicts may stem from disagreements within any given position on scale points given for expectations and negative norms, expectations and positive norms, or for positive norms and negative norms.

Results from the intra-positionally determined conflict analyses are shown in Tables 28 through 31. Each table presents findings related to a particular position and is further broken down according to teacher behavior category and type of cognitive discrepancy. (Basic data tables, showing all mean scores, are included in Appendixes B-8, B-9, and B-10.) All comparisons involving negative norms are based on inverted negative norm rank distributions.

Table 28 shows intra-positionally determined conflicts based on the teacher position. Only two conflicts stem from the expectation-positive norm comparison, both of which relate to community participation. Teachers approve of speaking out at PTA meetings in the auditorium more than they expect it, but they expect teachers to attend PTA meetings in the auditorium more than they approve of this activity.

Nine conflicts are found for the expectation-inverted negative norm comparison. Teachers have a tendency to dislike behaviors related to deviancy control, structuring or imposing of pressures upon pupils, and self-indulgence but expect teachers to engage in these activities. For maintenance of order, it may be seen that teachers dislike a lack of behaviors related to this area, but do not expect the performance by teachers of these behaviors. For the category of non-teaching maintenance functions, teachers dislike for teachers not to cooperate with other teachers but do not expect this activity. For this same category, a different pattern is found on an item pertaining to performance of menial tasks. Teachers dislike for teachers to perform menial tasks during basketball games in the gym, but expect this to be done.

Twelve significant cognitive discrepancies are found for the positive norm-inverted negative norm comparison. Teachers disapprove of the

TABLE 28

ROLE CONFLICTS FOR TEACHER BEHAVIORS BASED ON COGNITIVE DISCREPANCIES AMONG TEACHERS

Teacher Behavior Item	Expectation-Pos. Norm	Expectation-Neg. Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
DEVIANCY CONTROL			
Ignoring pupils misbehaving in classroom	--	.232**	.200**
Threatening pupils misbehaving in classroom	--	1.333***	.800***
MAINTENANCE OF ORDER			
Watching pupils during study period	--	- .739**	- .466**
Supervising pupils in a classroom test	--	- .733***	- .800***
Keeping pupils quiet in the library	--	- .457**	- .552***
Supervising on playground	--	--	- .518*
STRUCTURING			
Having pupils sing solos during classroom singing period	--	.615**	.758***

TABLE 28--Continued

Teacher Behavior Item	Expectation-Pos. Norm	Expectation-Neg. Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
SELF-INDULGENCE			
Visiting with other teachers on playground	--	.615**	.758***
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION			
Speaking out at PTA meeting in auditorium	- .883***	--	.334*
Attending PTA meeting in the auditorium	.554*	--	.724**
NON-TEACHING MAINTENANCE FUNCTIONS			
Cooperating with other teachers in school	--	- .419**	- .267*
Doing menial tasks during basketball games in gym	--	.750**	.467*

Note: For Tables 28 through 31, a negative sign in mean difference indicates that the cognition listed second in the comparison is greater. (A high mean score for all cognitions except inverted negative norms is indicative of a concern for a high frequency of the behavioral item involved. For negative norms, a high mean score is indicative of a concern for a low frequency of the behavior.)

performance of behaviors related to deviancy control, structuring, self-indulgence, and community participation, but the lack of performance of these behaviors is not approved. This same trend holds true for the performance of menial tasks during basketball games in the gym. For behaviors related to the maintenance of order, a slightly different pattern is found. Teachers have a tendency to dislike the lack of order maintenance, but at the same time do not approve of the performance of this activity. This latter pattern also is true for the behavioral item concerned with cooperation with other teachers in school.

Table 29 displays significant intra-positional disparities for parents. Only one conflict stems from the expectation-positive norm comparison. This relates to community participation, where parents approve of speaking out at PTA meetings in the auditorium more than they expect it. Nineteen disparities are found when contrasting expectations with inverted negative norms. For items related to the areas of deviancy control, structuring, and teaching-related maintenance functions, parents tend to show disapproval but expect teachers to engage in these activities. This trend holds for two items concerned with teacher self-indulgence also, ("visiting with other teachers on the playground" and "visiting with other teachers during a study period"). Parents tend to disapprove of the lack of order maintenance, community participation, and non-teaching related functions and do not strongly expect teachers to engage in these activities. This particular pattern is also applicable for two items dealing with teacher self-indulgence, ("allowing pupils to explore during experiments in the laboratory" and "singing during a classroom singing period").

Nineteen disparities are also found for the positive norm-inverted negative norm comparison. Parents tend to disapprove of deviancy control,

TABLE 29

ROLE CONFLICTS FOR TEACHER BEHAVIOR BASED ON COGNITIVE DISCREPANCIES AMONG PARENTS

Teacher Behavior Item	Expectation-Pos. Norm	Expectation-Neg. Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
DEVIANCE CONTROL			
Ignoring pupils misbehaving in a classroom	--	.305***	.096**
MAINTENANCE OF ORDER			
Watching pupils during study period	--	- .912***	- .702***
Supervising pupils in a classroom test	--	- .679***	- .474***
Keeping pupils quiet in the library	--	- .220***	- .285***
Policing the halls	--	- .976***	- .739***
Disciplining pupils during basketball game in gym	--	-1.133***	- .890***
Supervising on the playground	--	- .693***	- .545***

TABLE 29--Continued

Teacher Behavior Item	Expectation-Pos. Norm	Expectation-Neg. Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
[illegible]			
Having pupils sing solos during a classroom singing period	--	.156**	.322**
SELF-INDULGENCE			
Allowing pupils to explore during experiments in the laboratory	--	- .822***	- .857***
Singing during a classroom singing period	--	- .648***	- .692***
Visiting with other teachers on playground	--	.389***	.371***
Visiting with other teachers during study period	--	.079*	.209**
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION			
Speaking out at PTA meeting in auditorium	- .417**	- .732**	- .315*

TABLE 29--Continued

Teacher Behavior Item	Expectation-Pos. Norm	Expectation-Neg. Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
Attending PTA meeting in the auditorium	--	- .595***	- .022***
Visiting with parents during PTA meeting in the auditorium	--	- .608*	- .651*
Participating in community activities out of school	--	-1.435***	-1.390***
NON-TEACHING MAINTENANCE FUNCTIONS			
Cooperating with other teachers in school	--	- .239***	- .233**
Cooperating with the principal in school	--	- .160***	- .170**
TEACHING-RELATED MAINTENANCE FUNCTIONS			
Doing own studying and grading in library	--	--	- .480**
Reading own books during study period	--	.569**	--

structuring, and some behaviors related to teacher self-indulgence ("visiting with other teachers"), but the lack of these behaviors is not approved. Parents disapprove of the lack of order maintenance, community participation, non-teaching maintenance functions, teaching-related maintenance functions and some behaviors related to teacher self-indulgence ("allowing pupils to explore during experiments in the laboratory," and "singing during a classroom singing period") but the performance of these behaviors is not approved.

Table 30 includes intra-positionally determined conflicts for the pupil position. Two conflicts are found for the expectation-positive norm comparison. Pupils approve of teacher self-indulgence and community participation more than these activities are expected of teachers. Six disparities are found when comparing expectations against inverted negative norms. Pupils tend to disapprove of behaviors related to deviancy control and maintenance of order but these behaviors are somewhat expected of teachers. This pattern also holds for one behavior related to teacher self-indulgence ("visiting with other teachers during study period"). Pupils tend to disapprove of the lack of community participation and non-teaching maintenance functions and do not strongly expect teachers to engage in these activities. This latter pattern also applies to a self-indulgence item ("allowing pupils to explore during experiments in the laboratory").

Two significant disparities are found for the positive norm-inverted negative norm comparison, both of which relate to teacher self-indulgence. Teachers are disliked to visit with other teachers during a study period, but the lack of this behavior is not approved. Pupils dislike for teachers not to allow pupil experimentation in the laboratory, but allowance of this behavior is not approved.

TABLE 30

ROLE CONFLICTS FOR TEACHER BEHAVIORS BASED ON COGNITIVE DISCREPANCIES AMONG PUPILS

Teacher Behavior Item	Expectation-Pos. Norm	Expectation-Neg. Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
DEVIANCY CONTROL			
Threatening pupils misbehaving in classroom	--	.630**	--
MAINTENANCE OF ORDER			
Disciplining pupils in cafeteria	--	.853*	--
SELF-INDULGENCE			
Visiting with other teachers during study period	--	.238**	.190*
Allowing pupils to explore during experiments in laboratory	- .794***	-1.098***	- .304*
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION			
Speaking out at PTA meeting in auditorium	- .487*	--	--

TABLE 30--Continued

Teacher Behavior Item	Expectation-Pos. Norm	Expectation-Neg. Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
Attending PTA meeting in auditorium	--	- .363**	--
NON-TEACHING MAINTENANCE FUNCTIONS			
Cooperating with other teachers in school	--	- .151*	--

Table 31 displays significant intra-positional disparities for school officials. No conflicts are found when contrasting expectations with positive norms. For the expectational-inverted negative norm comparison, it may be observed that deviancy control is disapproved but expected. The lack of order maintenance is disapproved and activities related to order maintenance are not expected. A similar and consistent pattern is found for the positive norm-inverted negative norm comparisons, where deviancy control is disapproved by school officials and its absence is not approved. Also, the lack of order maintenance is disapproved, but the performance of activities related to maintenance of order is not approved.

Chapter Summary

Results reported in this chapter have been based on statistical analysis of scaled cognitions given by position members for selected teacher behaviors. Analyses have been made of discrepancies in scale points given within cognition type for teacher behaviors by members of different positions (inter-positional analysis) and also of discrepancies within given positions in scale points given for different cognitions for the same behavior (intra-positional analysis). Five hundred and forty inter-positional comparisons were made and 135 statistically significant disparities were found. Table 32 shows the number of significant inter-positional role conflicts, by behavior item category, positional comparison, and cognition. Table 33 summarizes the number of conflicts for each positional comparison.

Several trends may be observed in these two tables. First, it will be noted that there are more normative than expectational disparities, i.e. for all positional comparisons, the greatest number of disagreements

TABLE 31

ROLE CONFLICTS FOR TEACHER BEHAVIORS BASED ON COGNITIVE DISCREPANCIES AMONG SCHOOL OFFICIALS

Teacher Behavior Item	Expectation-Pos. Norm	Expectation-Neg. Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
DEVIANCY CONTROL			
Threatening pupils misbehaving in the classroom	--	1.238*	1.072*
MAINTENANCE OF ORDER			
Watching pupils during study period	--	- .628*	--
Supervising pupils in a classroom test	--	--	- .639*
Policing the halls	--	- .781*	- .823*

TABLE 32

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT INTER-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS, BY BEHAVIOR ITEM CATEGORY, POSITIONAL COMPARISON, AND COGNITION

Behavior Item Category	Positional Comparison	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Total
Maintenance of Order	Teachers-Parents	5	2	3	10
	Teachers-Pupils	0	1	0	1
	Teachers-Sch.Off.	1	0	0	1
	Parents-Pupils	4	5	1	10
	Parents-Sch.Off.	2	1	0	3
	Pupils-Sch.Off.	0	2	0	2
	Total	12	11	4	27
Deviancy Control	Teachers-Parents	1	2	0	3
	Teachers-Pupils	1	2	1	4
	Teachers-Sch.Off.	0	0	0	0
	Parents-Pupils	0	0	0	0
	Parents-Sch.Off.	3	1	1	5
	Pupils-Sch.Off.	3	0	1	4
	Total	8	5	3	16
Self-indulgence	Teachers-Parents	2	2	4	8
	Teachers-Pupils	4	3	5	12
	Teachers-Sch.Off.	0	0	0	0
	Parents-Pupils	2	3	0	5
	Parents-Sch.Off.	3	1	2	6
	Pupils-Sch.Off.	3	2	3	8
	Total	14	11	14	39

TABLE 32--Continued

Behavior Item Category	Positional Comparison	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Total
Community Participation	Teachers-Parents	2	3	1	6
	Teachers-Pupils	2	1	1	4
	Teachers-Sch.Off.	2	1	1	4
	Parents-Pupils	2	1	2	5
	Parents-Sch.Off.	0	0	1	1
	Pupils-Sch.Off.	0	0	0	0
	Total	8	6	6	20
Teacher Cooperation	Teachers-Parents	0	0	0	0
	Teachers-Pupils	1	2	1	4
	Teachers-Sch.Off.	0	0	1	1
	Parents-Pupils	0	2	0	2
	Parents-Sch.Off.	0	0	0	0
	Pupils-Sch.Off.	0	1	0	1
	Total	1	5	2	8
Miscellaneous Items	Teachers-Parents	1	3	1	5
	Teachers-Pupils	3	3	2	8
	Teachers-Sch.Off.	1	1	1	3
	Parents-Pupils	2	2	2	6
	Parents-Sch.Off.	0	0	0	0
	Pupils-Sch.Off.	1	1	1	3
	Total	8	10	7	25
TOTAL		51	48	36	135

is over positive norms and negative norms held for teacher behaviors. Slightly fewer disagreements exist when considering the actual appraisals of reality by respondents. Aside from the miscellaneous items which are not grouped according to a common content category, most of the disagreements center on behaviors having to do with teacher self-indulgence, maintenance of order, and community participation. Relatively few inter-positional disparities are found for behaviors dealing with teacher cooperation and deviancy control.

TABLE 33

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT INTER-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS, BY POSITIONAL COMPARISON

Positional Comparison	Number of Role Conflicts
Teachers - Parents	32
Teachers - Pupils	33
Teachers - School Officials	9
Parents - Pupils	28
Parents - School Officials	15
Pupils - School Officials	18
Total	135

Table 33 reveals that the greatest number of overall discrepancies occur when comparing pupils and adults. This is indicative of a basic difference in orientation to the school which may be reflective of the relative immaturity of the pupil respondents. This finding may also indicate that the particular interactions pupils have with the educational system (which are obviously unique) tend to provide a unique frame of reference for pupils as opposed to all other adults. A second major distinction is between the professional interest group (teachers and school officials) and parents. This is perhaps best interpreted as implying an influence of differences in the socialization processes required for membership in the various positions. It should also be noted, as one would expect, that differences between teachers and school officials are rare.

For the intra-positional analyses, a total of ninety comparisons were made for each of the four positions. Table 34 displays the number of significant intra-positional role conflicts, by behavior item category, position and cognitive comparison. (It should be noted that the behavior item categories used for the intra-positional analysis are not the same as those used for the inter-positional analysis. The behavior categories in both cases were identified in a manner consistent with the patterning of significant findings and/or the nature of the comparison being made.) Table 35 shows the number of role conflicts for each position.

It will be noted that approximately the same number of disparities stem from the expectation-inverted negative norm and positive norm-inverted negative norm comparisons. Relatively few conflicts stem from a comparison of expectations and positive norms. This indicates that teachers are, by and large, seen as performing those behaviors which are liked. However, the expectational-negative norm discrepancies indicate that teachers are seen as being guilty of performing behaviors which are also disliked. The positive norm-negative norm disparities indicate that numerous teacher behaviors are both liked and disliked by respondents. This latter form of cognitive disparity is perhaps most discouraging for the teacher. Findings relative to the areas of behavior upon which most of the disagreements center are similar to the pattern found for the inter-positional analysis. That is, the majority of the disparities center on

TABLE 34

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT INTRA-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS, BY BEHAVIOR ITEM CATEGORY, POSITION, AND COGNITIVE COMPARISON

Behavior Item Category	Position	Exp.-Pos.Norm	Exp.-Neg.Norm	Pos.Norm-Neg.Norm	Total
Deviancy Control	Teachers	0	2	2	4
	Parents	0	1	1	2
	Pupils	0	1	0	1
	Sch. Off.	0	1	1	2
	Total	0	5	4	9
Maintenance of Order	Teachers	0	3	4	7
	Parents	0	6	6	12
	Pupils	0	1	0	1
	Sch. Off.	0	2	2	4
	Total	0	12	12	24
Structuring	Teachers	0	1	1	2
	Parents	0	1	1	2
	Pupils	0	0	0	0
	Sch. Off.	0	0	0	0
	Total	0	2	2	4
Self-indulgence	Teachers	0	1	1	2
	Parents	0	4	4	8
	Pupils	1	2	2	5
	Sch. Off.	0	0	0	0
	Total	1	7	7	15

TABLE 34--Continued

Behavior Item Category	Position	Exp.-Pos.Norm	Exp.-Neg.Norm	Pos.Norm-Neg.Norm	Total
Community Participation	Teachers	2	0	2	4
	Parents	1	4	4	9
	Pupils	1	1	0	2
	Sch.Off.	0	0	0	0
	Total	4	5	6	15
Non-teaching Maintenance Functions	Teachers	0	2	2	4
	Parents	0	2	2	4
	Pupils	0	1	0	1
	Sch. Off.	0	0	0	0
	Total	0	5	4	9
Teaching-related Maintenance Functions	Teachers	0	0	0	0
	Parents	0	1	1	2
	Pupils	0	0	0	0
	Sch. Off.	0	0	0	0
	Total	0	1	1	2
TOTAL		5	37	36	78

behaviors related to teacher self-indulgence, maintenance of order, and community participation. Few intra-positional disparities are found for the areas of deviancy control, structuring, or teaching and non-teaching maintenance functions. Obviously, certain categories of teacher behavior are more controversial than others.

TABLE 35

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT INTRA-POSITIONAL
ROLE CONFLICTS BY POSITION

Position	Number of Role Conflicts
Teachers	23
Parents	39
Pupils	10
School Officials	6
Total	78

Table 35 shows that the greatest number of over-all intra-positional cognitive discrepancies occur for parents and teachers. Pupils and school officials exhibit very few disparities. This pattern is somewhat inconsistent with findings for the intra-positional analyses relating to cognitions for teacher characteristics, where teachers exhibited very few disparities and pupils exhibited a large number. Parents, for both analyses, have a large number of disparities and school officials have very few.

Hypotheses relating to the data reported in this chapter are discussed in Chapter VII.

CHAPTER VII

RESULTS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Review of the Purpose and Design of the Study

The present study was directed toward the identification of role conflicts for public school teachers in a metropolitan area. Role conflict was defined as the existence of disparities between cognitions held for teacher behavior or other characteristics by members of various social positions. Only disparities logically implying a potential for personal discomfort on the part of the teacher were studied.

Members of four social positions: teachers, parents, public school pupils, and school officials were interviewed, and their norms and expectations for the teacher were compared to obtain role disparities. All respondents were selected on a stratified-random basis from public schools in the Greater Kansas City Metropolitan Area. The final sample, from which data were actually collected, included 98 teachers, 261 parents, 237 pupils, and 67 school officials.

Two instruments were used in the study to collect data relevant to cognitions held for public school teachers. Both of these instruments were a part of a larger set of instruments used in conjunction with the Kansas City Teacher Role Study. (Examples of these two instruments may be found in Appendix A-1 and A-2.) Form Two was an open-ended instrument designed to elicit cognitions held for teacher characteristics. Form Four was a closed-ended instrument designed to measure cognitions held for teacher behaviors. Thirty different teacher behaviors were included on this form. Respondents gave pre-scaled positive norms, negative norms, and expectations for these behaviors. Points ranged from five (high frequency of the behavior) to one (low frequency of the behavior). Separate points were given for each cognition.

Volunteered responses for teacher characteristics collected from Form Two were coded according to general content category and for apparent point given on a five-point scale dealing with presence or high frequency of the characteristic (point one) or absence or low frequency of the characteristic (point five). These data were analysed to discover the extent of positional differences in content area usage (ignoring point-spread). A second type of analysis for these data was concerned with a comparison, by position, of point-spread within content areas used to describe teacher characteristics. This latter analysis constituted a study of role conflicts based on discrepant cognitions held for teacher characteristics. Analyses were made of discrepancies among positions in terms of scale points given for content areas within cognition type (inter-positionally determined conflict) and also of discrepancies within positions in terms of scale points given for content areas used for more than one cognition type (intra-positionally determined conflict).

Data relative to cognitions for teacher behaviors collected with Form Four were analysed for both inter-position and intra-position disparities. For the inter-positional comparison, an analysis was made of discrepancies in scale points given within cognition type for teacher behaviors by members of different positions. The intra-positional comparison consisted of an analysis of discrepancies within given positions in scale points given for different cognitions for the same behavior.

Statistical calculations for the study were made at the computing centers of the University of Missouri and Oklahoma State University. Statistical tests utilized included the *t* test and the Mann-Whitney *U* test.

Summary of Findings

Findings in a study of this scope have a tendency to be numerous and complex. Such was obviously the case in the present research. For purposes of expediency and clarity, these findings are summarized primarily according to the hypotheses which were tested. (No specific hypotheses were tested in the analysis of positional usage of content areas for describing teacher characteristics. Consequently, findings for this analysis are summarized before a discussion of findings related to hypotheses is given.)

Several interesting trends were found in the data relative to positional usage of content areas for describing teacher characteristics. First, it was found that the number of significant differences for any positional comparison did not vary greatly according to cognition type. That is, approximately the same number of significant differences were found for positive norm, negative norm, and expectational usage of content areas. Secondly, the majority of significant differences (for all three types of cognitions) were found to stem from the comparison of pupils versus adult respondents, and from parents versus teachers and school officials. Few significant differences in content area usage were found when contrasting teachers versus school officials. (It should be noted that this finding related to positional differences was also borne out in all other analyses made in the study.)

The majority of content areas involved in significant differences of positional usage were classified as manners. Content areas used

3/

predominantly by pupils were concerned on the one hand, with pupil freedom, and on the other, with a very vague set of "all-American ethics" for teachers. Adults, especially teachers and school officials, used content areas predominantly which were concerned with teacher ability and specific levels of interactional performance. A much wider variety of content areas was used by adults than by pupils. These were also generally at a higher level of sophistication. Finally, it was found that there was a great deal of interdependence in the usage of content areas by all positions across cognition type. That is, most respondents had a tendency to utilize similar content areas for describing teacher characteristics, regardless of whether expressing positive norms, negative norms, or expectations.

Several general hypotheses were tested in the present study. These were related to scale-point data collected for both teacher characteristics and teacher behaviors. Each hypothesis is listed and related findings discussed immediately following. Hypotheses I, II, and III were concerned with inter-positional disparities, while Hypotheses IV and V were related to intra-positional disparities. Hypothesis VI was concerned with both inter-positional and intra-positional disparities.

> Hypothesis I - The incidence of positive norm conflict will be higher than expectational conflict.

Only random significance was found for the inter-positional analysis of cognitions relating to teacher characteristics and consequently this hypothesis could not be tested with these data. However, results for the inter-positional analysis relating to cognitions for teacher behaviors confirm the hypothesis. Five hundred and forty comparisons were made and 135 significant discrepancies were found. Of this total number, fifty-one disparities were for positive norms and only thirty-six were for expectations.

> Hypothesis II - The incidence of negative norm conflict will be higher than expectational conflict.

Because only random significance was found for the inter-positional analysis of cognitions relating to teacher characteristics, no test was made of this hypothesis with these data. But the hypothesis was confirmed when considering comparable data for teacher behaviors. Out of a total of 135 significant discrepancies, forty-eight were attributable to differences in negative norms and only thirty-six attributable to differences in expectations.

Findings for Hypotheses I and II indicate that, at least for teacher behaviors, most disparities between positions are centered around diagreements on what is considered desirable and what is considered undesirable. Fewer disparities stem from disagreements on the appraisal of social reality. Overall, most of the inter-positional disparities for norms centered on behaviors related to teacher self-indulgence and maintenance of order, whereas the greatest porportion of expectational disparities centered on behaviors having to do with teacher self-indulgence and community participation.

> Hypothesis III - Consensus among positions on cognitions for teacher behaviors and characteristics will be positively related to the rate of interaction such positions have with each other.

It was impossible to test this hypothesis with data related to cognitions for teacher characteristics. Only a random significance was found in these data. The hypothesis was tentatively confirmed, however, when considering data relative to teacher behaviors. It was found that most of the discrepancies occurred when comparing pupils versus adults. It might be concluded that this finding is reflective of unique experiences and interactions which the pupils have with adults, and particularly teachers. Pupils typically take a subordinate position in interactions with adults, and do not interact with them frequently on the same level. Perhaps also reflected here is the relative lack of sophistication of pupils as opposed to adults. A second source of support for the hypothesis was the fact that the professional interest group (teachers and school officials) differed frequently from parents on cognitions for teacher behaviors. Again, it might be suggested that a lack of communication and interaction between school personnel and lay persons would empirically lead to such a finding. As was expected, few disparities were found when contrasting teachers with school officials. This is perhaps related to the influence of common socialization processes required for position incumbency and also to a commonality of interest in, and interaction concerning, the operation and maintenance of the educational system. It was found that most of the discrepancies between teachers and parents were centered on behaviors related to teacher self-indulgence and the maintenance of order. Teachers and pupils disagreed primarily on teacher self-indulgence and teachers and school officials on community participation. Findings indicate that the major source of disagreement between parents and pupils concerned maintenance of order and community participation. School officials disagreed with both parents and pupils on behaviors primarily related to the general area of teacher self-indulgence, and with parents on deviancy control.

> Hypothesis IV - The incidence of normative-normative conflict will be higher than normative-expectational conflict.

Two contrasting sources of evidence were found in the intra-positional analyses for evaluating this hypothesis. For the intra-positional analysis of cognitions related to teacher characteristics, the data indicated that the associated hypothesis should be infirmed. The majority of cognitive discrepancies, for all positions considered, stemmed from normative-expectational differences. The positive norm-expectational disparities are indicative of the fact that teachers are not expected to possess all the desired characteristics identified by various reference groups (including teachers themselves). Expectational-negative norm disparities indicate that teachers are expected to possess certain characteristics which are disapproved. As indicated by the number of positive norm-negative norm disparities, only a few teacher characteristics are both liked and disliked by members of the same position. Overall, most of the intra-positional discrepancies were over teacher characteristics classified as manners, which is indicative of general concern for "how" a teacher behaves. Slightly fewer discrepancies were found for teacher actions, and discrepancies over features, backgrounds and imputed cognitive structures were extremely rare.

Findings for the intra-positional analysis of cognitions for teacher behaviors showed a different pattern and indicated that no clear-cut test of the related hypothesis could be made. Approximately the same number of disparities were found for the positive norm-negative norm comparison as were found for the expectation-negative norm comparison. Very few disparities were found for the expectation-positive norm comparison. These findings indicate that teachers are expected by members of various social positions to perform behaviors which are disliked. Also, many behaviors are at the same time approved and disapproved. But, there is an overall congruity between what is expected by way of teacher behaviors and what is approved. Most of the intra-positional discrepancies based on cognitions for teacher behaviors were centered around the general areas of order maintenance, teacher self-indulgence, and community participation. This pattern was generally consistent for all types of cognitive comparisons, and matched findings related to the inter-positional analysis for teacher behaviors.

> Hypothesis V - The greater the homogeneity of positional requirements and preparation, the greater will be the intra-positional consensus on cognitions for teacher behaviors or other characteristics.

Findings for the intra-positional analysis of cognitions for teacher characteristics allowed confirmation of this hypothesis but it could not be adequately tested with respect to data for teacher behaviors. Findings related to cognitions for teacher characteristics indicated that positions not having rigorous socialization processes necessary for membership (parents and pupils) were the ones where intra-positional disparity was high in frequency. Those positions having standardized prerequisites for incumbency (teachers and school officials) had fewer cognitive disparities. Discrepancies for parents and for pupils were centered on teacher characteristics classified as manners, whereas teachers disagreed among themselves on the same number of actions and manners. School officials exhibited only random significance. Few discrepancies (for any position) were found for features, backgrounds, or imputed cognitive structures.

For the study of intra-positional disparities in cognitions for teacher behaviors, it was found that the greatest number of discrepancies occurred for parents and teachers. Pupils and school officials had considerably fewer disparities. Teachers and school officials disagreed primarily on behaviors related to maintenance of order, whereas parents disagreed primarily on maintenance of order, teacher self-indulgence, and community participation. Most of the disparities for pupils occurred for the general area of teacher self-indulgence.

The fact that there was an inconsistency in findings for intra-positional disparities relating to teacher characteristics and teacher behaviors may be artifactive due to differences in methods of data collection and analysis. Responses were volunteered for teacher characteristics and subsequently coded, while the responses for teacher behaviors were given for pre-structured questions so that all respondents reacted to the same items.

> Hypothesis VI - The incidence of inter-positionally determined conflict will be higher than intra-positionally determined conflict.

This hypothesis was overwhelmingly infirmed for the teacher characteristics analysis. There were twenty significant inter-positionally determined conflicts (random significance only) and ninety-six significant intra-positionally determined conflicts. However, this finding may be artifactive due to the differences in the forms of the distributions being compared in the intra-positional analysis. The negative norms, for instance, had a greater tendency toward bimodality than did the expectational or positive norm distributions.

For the teacher behavior analysis, this hypothesis was confirmed. There were 135 significant inter-positionally determined conflicts and only seventy-eight intra-positional conflicts.

Implications

Several general implications of the findings may be noted. Some of these apply to education or teacher role and others to role theory.

For Education or Teacher Role

In the present study, numerous and significant role conflicts were found to exist for teacher behaviors and other characteristics. The variety and nature of these role conflicts have implications for an understanding of many of our current educational problems.

The fact that most of the inter-positional role conflicts stemmed from disagreements on elements of the teacher role by pupils versus adults and by professional interest groups versus non-professional interest groups implies a lack of clarity and consensus on methods for achieving objectives in our public educational system. More specifically, this implies a basic disagreement on the role of the teacher by those who are recipients of educational services and those who perform these services. Thus the teacher, in attempting to perform his functions in the educational system, is rather consistently and frequently evaluated within a frame of reference different from his own. This may tend to account, in large, for teacher unhappiness and lead to the high rate of turnover. It is, however, significant to note that only a very few disagreements on teacher role exist between teachers and school officials. Teachers and school officials tend to agree on the role of the teacher--however, this bears relevance only for the internal consistency of the social system. One implication of this is that two-way channels of communication designed to interpret the role of the teacher (and the function of the educational system) for lay community members are not as effective as they might be. The fact that pupils disagree with all other adults on the role of the teacher may perhaps best be related to both the differences in levels of maturity of these groups and also differences in the nature of experiences they have had with the school (and with teachers).

The fact that there were a large number of role conflicts which stemmed from cognitive discrepancies within given positions implies that the teacher, even in attempting to meet the demands of a particular position, cannot effectively use a singular approach. That is, the very same teacher behaviors or characteristics are, very often, approved and disapproved, approved and not expected, or disapproved and expected. This is especially true of certain positions, particularly parents. This is also somewhat true of pupils and even teachers themselves. It is, however, encouraging to note that school officials only rarely disagree among themselves on expectations and norms for teachers. Teachers can at least assume that fulfillment of the requirements imposed by superiors will be somewhat consistently appraised by these superiors.

The majority of role conflicts based on teacher characteristics were centered on 'manneristic' characteristics. This implies a somewhat serious problem for teachers in that it is perhaps more difficult to modify 'how' something is done that 'what' is done. That is, the manneristic patterns of individuals are probably intrinsically related to personality and remain relatively stable over a period of time. That this aspect of the teacher's role is so controversial imposes somewhat an impossible role conflict resolution task upon teachers.

Overwhelmingly, the teacher behaviors over which there were the most normative and expectational disagreements were related to order maintenance, teacher self-indulgence, and community participation. That these particular areas of teacher behavior are controversial and sensitive to cognitive discrepancies would be expected.

These areas of behavior are those which are important for and particularly visable to those concerned with education. That the teacher is faced with incompatible demands and pressures in these areas implies, again, a potential for personal problems. The teacher cannot, within the realms of these behavioral areas, adequately satisfy members of all positions. However, if the teacher is aware of the nature of these incompatibilities, he can resolve the conflicts on an objective basis. That is, the teacher can choose to satisfy one set of demands over another. A most unfortunate situation occurs when the teacher does not have a reasoned justification for his behavior and becomes the recipient of uncomfortable pressures which he does not understand.

For Role Theory

The present study has indicated that it is fruitful to conceptualize "role" as the set of cognitions held for the members of a social position. Furthermore, the distinction between valued cognitions (norms) and non-valued cognitions (expectations) has proved useful for identifying explicitely a variety of role conflicts. Few previous role studies have utilized expectations. Moreover, little or no study has previously been done on role conflict where expectations and norms were contrasted. But it is reasonable to assume that expectations might in some cases be different from norms and that a comparison of these cognitions might indicate an additional dimension of role conflict. This was certainly borne out in the data of the present study. That is, quite a large number of discrepancies were found when contrasting the norms held by members of a given position with the expectations held.

Recommendations

To state that additional explorations are needed in verification of the findings for this study is to suggest only the obvious. Several limitations of the study are apparent. The data were collected from a limited sample in only a single metropolitan area. The data collection instruments and analysis techniques require extensive modification, and finally, insufficient coverage was obtained of content areas for the teacher role, and the possible influence of a number of independent variables was not explored.

It is possible, however, to suggest potential areas for future related research. It would, first of all, be fruitful if attempts could be made to replicate these findings in other communities using refined instruments and procedures. A second logical area for needed research is related to a study of the extent to which teachers recognize role conflicts impinging on them. Also, a study of patterns of role conflict resolution is implied.

Finally, it is hoped that the conceptual and theoretical distinctions used in this study might be applied experimentally in other contexts and their fertility examined. This could conceivably be done for other social positions either related or not related to the educational system.

[redacted]

STRATHMORE PARCHMENT
100% COTTON FIBER USA

APPENDIX A
DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS AND CODES

APPENDIX A-1
TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS QUESTIONNAIRE
FORM TWO-A*

Question 1 What different, general characteristics of teachers do you really like or dislike?

The following spaces are to provide room for you to list different general characteristics of teachers which you really like or dislike. Please list your likes in the upper spaces and your dislikes in the lower spaces. Please fill all the spaces, if you can.

LIKES

1.____

2.____

3.____

4.____

5.____

DISLIKES

1.____

2.____

3.____

4.____

5.____

---

*An alternate form of this instrument, based on "types of teachers" was also used in the study to secure cognitions for teacher characteristics. However, the data collected from the two instruments were considered equivalent.

Question 2 What different, general characteristics do you think are most often found in teachers?

The following spaces are to provide room for you to list different general characteristics of teachers which you think are commonly found in teachers. Please fill all spaces, if you can.

1.____________________________________

2.____________________________________

3.____________________________________

4.____________________________________

5.____________________________________

6.____________________________________

7.____________________________________

8.____________________________________

9.____________________________________

10.___________________________________

APPENDIX A-2

TEACHER BEHAVIOR SCALE--POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE NORMS
FORM FOUR-A*

What do you most like and least like teachers to do?

		Most Like	Least Like
1. Watching pupils during study period	A great deal of watching pupils	5	5
I most like and least like teachers during a study period to do:	A lot of watching pupils	4	4
	A moderate amount of watching pupils	3	3
	A slight amount of watching pupils	2	2
	Little or no watching pupils	1	1
2. Supervising pupils in a classroom test	A great deal of supervising pupils	5	5
I most like and least like teachers during a classroom test to do:	A lot of supervising pupils	4	4
	A moderate amount of supervising pupils	3	3
	A slight amount of supervising pupils	2	2
	Little or no supervising pupils	1	1
3. Singing during a classroom singing period	A great deal of singing	5	5
I most like and least like teachers during a classroom singing period to do:	A lot of singing	4	4
	A moderate amount of singing	3	3
	A slight amount of singing	2	2
	Little or no singing	1	1

---

*Three sub-forms, of which Form Four-A is an example, were used to secure first-order cognitions for teacher behavior. A complete list of behavioral content areas used in these three forms is presented in Appendix A-4. (Form Four also included questions designed to measure attributed cognitions. Attributed cognitions, however, were not used in the present research.)

TEACHER BEHAVIOR SCALE--POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE NORMS--Continued

4. Ignoring pupils misbehaving in a classroom I most like and least like teachers in a classroom to do:	A great deal of ignoring pupils misbehaving	5	5
	A lot of ignoring pupils misbehaving	4	4
	A moderate amount of ignoring pupils misbehaving	3	3
	A slight amount of ignoring pupils misbehaving	2	2
	Little or no ignoring pupils misbehaving	1	1
5. Keeping pupils quiet in the library I most like and least like teachers in the library to do:	A great deal of keeping pupils quiet	5	5
	A lot of keeping pupils quiet	4	4
	A moderate amount of keeping pupils quiet	3	3
	A slight amount of keeping pupils quiet	2	2
	Little or no keeping pupils quiet	1	1
6. Speaking out at PTA meeting in the auditorium I most like and least like teachers at a PTA meeting in the auditorium to do:	A great deal of speaking out	5	5
	A lot of speaking out	4	4
	A moderate amount of speaking out	3	3
	A slight amount of speaking out	2	2
	Little or no speaking out	1	1
7. Policing the halls I most like and least like teachers in the halls to do:	A great deal of policing	5	5
	A lot of policing	4	4
	A moderate amount of policing	3	3
	A slight amount of policing	2	2
	Little or no policing	1	1

TEACHER BEHAVIOR SCALE--POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE NORMS--Continued

8. Disciplining pupils during basket-ball game in the gym I most like and least like teachers at a basketball game in the gym to do:	A great deal of disciplining pupils	5	5
	A lot of disciplining pupils	4	4
	A moderate amount of disciplining pupils	3	3
	A slight amount of disciplining pupils	2	2
	Little or no disciplining pupils	1	1
9. Visiting with other teachers on the playground I most like and least like teachers on the playground to do:	A great deal of visiting with other teachers	5	5
	A lot of visiting with other teachers	4	4
	A moderate amount of visiting with other teachers	3	3
	A slight amount of visiting with other teachers	2	2
	Little or no visiting with other teachers	1	1
10. Cooperating with other teachers in the school I most like and least like teachers in school to do:	A great deal of cooperating with other teachers	5	5
	A lot of cooperating with other teachers	4	4
	A moderate amount of cooperating with other teachers	3	3
	A slight amount of cooperating with other teachers	2	2
	Little or no cooperating with other teachers	1	1

APPENDIX A-3

TEACHER BEHAVIOR SCALE--EXPECTATIONS
FORM FOUR-A

What do you expect of teachers?

1. Watching pupils during study period I expect that during a study period most teachers would do:	A great deal of watching pupils A lot of watching pupils A moderate amount of watching pupils A slight amount of watching pupils Little or no watching pupils	5 4 3 2 1
2. Supervising pupils in a classroom test I expect that during a classroom test most teachers would do:	A great deal of supervising pupils A lot of supervising pupils A moderate amount of supervising pupils A slight amount of supervising pupils Little or no supervising pupils	5 4 3 2 1
3. Singing during a classroom singing period I expect that during a classroom singing period most teachers would do:	A great deal of singing A lot of singing A moderate amount of singing A slight amount of singing Little or no singing	5 4 3 2 1
4. Ignoring pupils misbehaving in a classroom I expect that when pupils misbehave in the classroom most teachers would do:	A great deal of ignoring pupils misbehaving A lot of ignoring pupils misbehaving A moderate amount of ignoring pupils misbehaving A slight amount of ignoring pupils misbehaving Little or no ignoring pupils misbehaving	5 4 3 2 1

TEACHER BEHAVIOR SCALE--EXPECTATIONS--*Continued*

5. *Keeping pupils quiet in the library*

I expect that in the library most teachers would do:

A great deal of keeping pupils quiet	5
A lot of keeping pupils quiet	4
A moderate amount of keeping pupils quiet	3
A slight amount of keeping pupils quiet	2
Little or no keeping pupils quiet	1

6. *Speaking out at PTA meeting in the auditorium*

I expect that at a PTA meeting in the auditorium most teachers would do:

A great deal of speaking out	5
A lot of speaking out	4
A moderate amount of speaking out	3
A slight amount of speaking out	2
Little or no speaking out	1

7. *Policing the halls*

I expect that in the halls most teachers would do:

A great deal of policing	5
A lot of policing	4
A moderate amount of policing	3
A slight amount of policing	2
Little or no policing	1

8. *Disciplining pupils during basketball game in the gym*

I expect that at a basketball game in the gym most teachers would do:

A great deal of disciplining pupils	5
A lot of disciplining pupils	4
A moderate amount of disciplining pupils	3
A slight amount of disciplining pupils	2
Little or no disciplining pupils	1

9. *Visiting with other teachers on the playground*

I expect that on the playground most teachers would do:

A great deal of visiting with other teachers	5
A lot of visiting with other teachers	4
A moderate amount of visiting with other teachers	3
A slight amount of visiting with other teachers	2
Little or no visiting with other teachers	1

TEACHER BEHAVIOR SCALE--EXPECTATIONS--Continued

10. Cooperating with other teachers in school	A great deal of cooperating with other teachers	5
I expect that in school most teachers would do:	A lot of cooperating with other teachers	4
	A moderate amount of cooperating with other teachers	3
	A slight amount of cooperating with other teachers	2
	Little or no cooperating with other teachers	1

APPENDIX A-4

A COMPLETE LIST OF CONTENT AREAS USED IN FORM FOUR

Content Area	Sub-Form Identification
Watching pupils during study period	A
Supervising pupils in a classroom test	A
Singing during a classroom singing period	A
Ignoring pupils misbehaving in a classroom	A
Keeping pupils quiet in the library	A
Speaking out at PTA meeting in the auditorium	A
Policing the halls	A
Disciplining pupils during basketball game in the gym	A
Visiting with other teachers on the playground	A
Cooperating with other teachers in the school	A
Visiting with other teachers during study period	B
Watching for cheaters during a classroom test	B
Having pupils sing solos during a classroom singing period	B
Telling misbehaving pupils in the classroom to stop talking	B
Doing own studying and grading in the library	B
Attending PTA meetings in the auditorium	B
Allowing pupils to explore during experiments in the laboratory	B
Kibitzing during basketball game in gym	B
Supervising on playground	B
Cooperating with the principal in school	B
Reading own books during study period	C
Leaving the room during a classroom test	C
Grading papers during a classroom singing period	C
Threatening pupils misbehaving in the classroom	C
Choosing books for pupils in the classroom	C
Visiting with parents during PTA meeting in the auditorium	C
Being partisan during football game on athletic field	C
Doing menial tasks during basketball game in gym	C
Disciplining pupils in the cafeteria	C
Participating in community activities out of school	C

APPENDIX A-5

A COMPLETE LIST OF CONTENT AREAS USED FOR THE CODING OF FORM TWO DATA*

Action Content Areas

Adjusts
Advises
Agrees
Answers
Appears to be
Assigns
Attends
Is Aware of
Boasts
Brings
Is broadminded
Acts calm
Cheers
Chooses
Collects
Concentrates
Controls others
Cooperates
Demonstrates
Dependable
Directs
Disciplines
Does not discriminate
Does not consume drugs
Encourages
Enforces
Enters
Evaluates
Experiments
Expresses satisfaction
Eats food
Forgives
Gossips
Helps

Identifies
Improves
Inquires
Instructs
Interferes
Investigates
Keeps busy
Leads
Engages in leisure activity
Does not consume liquor
Listens to
Locates
Is loyal
Maintains
Meets
Is a model
Moves about
Does not nag
Observes
Officiates
Participates
Performs
Permits
Takes care of personal needs
Persuades
Plans
Polices
Practices
Praises
Is present in setting
Protects
Reads
Remembers
Reminds

---

*This list represents an identification of only the content areas used in the code for Form Two. The actual code provided also for an identification of apparent point given by respondents within the content areas. These points, on a five-point continuum, were based on the amounts or varieties of the content areas which were liked, disliked, or expected of teachers.

A COMPLETE LIST OF CONTENT AREAS USED FOR THE CODING OF FORM TWO DATA--Continued

Respects
Ruins
Controls self
Sings
Does not smoke
Starts
Stresses
Studies
Suggests
Supervises
Does not swear
Threatens
Uses
Verbalizes
Is versatile
Works
Writes

Manner Content Area

Agressively
Alertly
Amount of
Approachable
Appropriately
Certainty
Cleanliness
Clearly
Consistently
Correctly
Courteously
Creatively
Culture
Democratically
Dignified
Diligently
Diplomatically
Easily
Energetically
Enthusiastically
Ethically
Fairly
Firmly
Fluently
Foresightedly
Frankly
Friendly
Generously
Good
Gracefully
Grammatically
Happily
Healthily
Honestly
Humorously
Imaginatively
Independently
Interesting
Kindly
Knowledgeably
Lovingly
Maturely
Modern
Orally
Orderly
Patiently
Personably
Pleasantly
Practically
Privately
Professionally
Promptly
Quickly
Quietly
Reasonably
Resourcefully
Satisfactorily
Seriously
Shyly
Sincerely
Successfully
Thoroughly
Thoughtfully
Well-groomed

Imputed Cognitive Structures

Able to do
Attempt to
Believe in
Consider
Desire to
Enjoy doing
Expect to
Familiar with doing
Fearful
Good habits
Good ideas
Interested in
Motivated to
Oriented to
Pretend to

A COMPLETE LIST OF CONTENT AREAS USED FOR THE CODING OF FORM TWO DATA--*Continued*

Refuse to
Satisfied to
Understanding of doing
Willing to

Features

Age
Health
Hearing ability
Mental ability
Physical attractiveness
Physical size
Race
Sex
Vision
Voice quality

Backgrounds

Number of children
Community-civic participation
Community size (from whence came)
Community type (from whence came)
Educational background
Family background
General vs. specific teaching
Marital status
Quality of education
Religious affiliation
Religious background
Amount of salary
Section of country (from whence came
Size of school system
Social class
Subjects taught or interested in
Teaching experience
Teaching level
Amount of past travel
Work experience (non-teaching)

Reactions of others to teachers

Appreciated by others
Looked up to
Socially acceptable
Well liked

APPENDIX B
BASIC DATA TABLES

APPENDIX B-1
CONTENT AREAS USED BY FIVE PER CENT OR MORE OF ALL RESPONDENTS (FORM TWO)

CONTENT[a]	Total Use (N=672) n	%[b]
Action Content Areas		
Does not discriminate	195	29.0
Helps	168	24.9
Is Broadminded	158	23.5
Cooperates	114	16.9
Controls self	91	13.5
Controls others	81	12.1
Discusses	78	11.6
Expresses satisfaction	63	9.4
Enforces	58	8.6
Disciplines	57	8.5
Improves	41	6.1
Encourages	37	5.5
Permits	34	5.1
Manner Content Areas		
Thoughtfully	225	33.5
Firmly	221	32.9
Friendly	193	28.7
Professionally	169	25.1
Lovingly	164	24.4
Fairly	154	22.9
Well-groomed	145	21.6
Humorously	140	20.8
Patiently	133	19.8
Orderly	132	19.6
Kindly	131	19.5
Happily	129	19.2
Pleasantly	127	18.9
Knowledgeably	126	18.7
Good	115	17.1

BASIC DATA TABLE 1--*Continued*

CONTENT	Total Use (N=672) n	Total Use (N=672) %
Reasonably	107	15.9
Sincerely	96	14.3
Diligently	79	11.8
Personably	77	11.5
Interesting	58	8.6
Ethically	56	8.3
Courteously	50	7.4
Honestly	50	7.4
Creatively	43	6.4
Democratically	40	5.9
Certainty	39	5.8
Cleanliness	38	5.7
Enthusiastically	37	5.5
Appropriately	35	5.2
Modern	34	5.1
Imputed Cognitive Structures		
Interested in	183	27.2
Able to	121	18.0
Motivated to	86	12.8
Enjoys	84	12.4
Features		
Young	79	11.7
Smart	46	6.8
Pleasant Voice	44	6.5
Attractive	36	5.4
Backgrounds		
Well educated	68	10.1
Participates in Community	39	5.8

[a] All content areas are designated with a term expressing the positive or socially approved end of the scale.

[b] Percentages reported in this table are based on the proportion of total respondents who used each content area. Consequently, percentages for all content areas combined add up to more than 100%.

APPENDIX B-2

BASIC DATA TABLE 2
PERCENTAGE USE BY POSITION OF CONTENT AREAS DESCRIPTIVE OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS--POSITIVE NORMS (FORM TWO)

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98)		Parents (N=260)[a]		Pupils (N=227)[b]		School Officials (N=67)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Is Broadminded	15	15.306	17	7.700	7	3.083	12	17.910
Controls Others	7	7.142	25	9.615	15	6.607	2	2.985
Cooperates	15	15.306	28	10.769	2	.880	14	20.895
Disciplines	4	4.081	12	4.615	7	3.083	2	2.985
Does Not Discriminate	3	3.061	12	4.615	13	5.726		
Encourages	4	4.081	12	4.615	6	2.643		
Enforces	1	1.020	9	3.461	19	8.370	1	1.492
Expresses Satisfaction	1	1.020	1	.384	1	.440	1	1.492

[a] The actual number of parents responding was 261. However, one parent failed to complete Form Two.

[b] The actual number of pupils responding was 237. Ten pupils, however, did not complete Form Two.

BASIC DATA TABLE 2--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98) n	Teachers (N=98) %	Parents (N=260) n	Parents (N=260) %	Pupils (N=227) n	Pupils (N=227) %	School Officials (N=67) n	School Officials (N=67) %
Helps	15	15.306	36	13.846	56	24.669	6	8.955
Improves	5	5.102	2	7.690			7	10.447
Permits					20	8.810		
Controls Self	2	2.040	10	3.846	8	3.524	4	5.970
Discusses	2	2.040	14	5.384	21	9.251		
Appropriately	2	2.040	2	7.690	4	1.762	1	1.492
Certainty	3	3.061	5	1.923	5	2.202	2	2.985
Cleanliness	5	5.102	11	4.230	3	1.321	4	5.970
Courteously	4	4.081	12	4.615	10	4.405	2	2.985
Creatively	5	5.102	4	1.538	4	1.762	6	8.955
Democratically	4	4.081	3	1.153	5	2.202	4	5.970
Diligently	5	5.102	2	.769	3	1.321	4	5.970
Enthusiastically	5	5.102	4	1.538	1	.440	6	8.955
Ethically	5	5.102	13	5.000	2	.881	6	8.955
Fairly	20	20.408	35	13.461	25	11.013	9	13.432

BASIC DATA TABLE 2--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98)		Parents (N=260)		Pupils (N=227)		School Officials (N=67)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Firmly	8	8.163	70	26.923	62	27.312	8	11.940
Friendly	30	30.612	52	20.000	36	15.859	12	17.910
Good			1	.384	49	21.585		
Happily	6	6.122	20	7.692	13	5.726	6	8.955
Honestly	5	5.102	12	4.615	1	.440	7	10.447
Humorously	25	25.510	30	11.538	51	22.466	9	13.432
Kindly	12	12.244	33	12.692	29	12.775	3	4.477
Knowledgeably	23	23.469	31	11.923	21	9.251	17	25.373
Lovingly	21	21.428	52	20.000	6	2.643	13	19.402
Orderly	21	21.428	43	16.538	12	5.286	11	16.417
Patiently	12	12.244	35	13.461	18	7.929	5	7.462
Personably	13	13.265	21	8.076	10	4.405	13	19.402
Pleasantly	20	20.408	43	16.538	26	11.453	7	10.447
Professionally	12	12.244	17	6.538			12	17.910

BASIC DATA TABLE 2--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98) n	Teachers (N=98) %	Parents (N=260) n	Parents (N=260) %	Pupils (N=227) n	Pupils (N=227) %	School Officials (N=67) n	School Officials (N=67) %
Reasonably			10	3.846	14	6.617		
Sincerely	10	10.204	15	5.769	4	1.762	12	17.910
Thoughtfully	24	24.489	68	26.153	33	14.537	14	20.895
Well-groomed	17	17.346	21	8.076	17	7.488	13	19.402
Modern	4	4.081	7	2.692	2	.881		
Interesting	2	2.040	13	5.000	17	7.488	2	2.985
Able to	13	13.265	23	8.846	5	2.202	12	17.910
Enjoys	8	8.163	21	8.076	6	2.643	9	13.432
Interested in	20	20.408	52	20.000	10	4.405	8	11.940
Motivated to	3	3.061	19	7.307			7	10.447
Young	1	1.020	10	3.846	14	6.167	1	1.492
Attractive	5	5.102	5	1.923	12	5.286	1	1.492
Pleasant Voice	5	5.102	11	4.230	5	2.202	2	2.985
Smart	3	3.061	8	3.076	3	1.321	7	10.447
Participates in Community	2	2.040	5	1.923			5	7.462

BASIC DATA TABLE 2--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98) n	Teachers (N=98) %	Parents (N=260) n	Parents (N=260) %	Pupils (N=227) n	Pupils (N=227) %	School Officials (N=67) n	School Officials (N=67) %
Well Educated	8	8.163	20	7.692	4	1.762	8	11.940

APPENDIX B-3

BASIC DATA TABLE 3
PERCENTAGE USE BY POSITION OF CONTENT AREAS DESCRIPTIVE OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS--NEGATIVE NORMS (FORM TWO)

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98)		Parents (N=260)		Pupils (N=227)		School Officials (N=67)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Is Broadminded	27	27.551	37	14.230	15	6.607	13	19.402
Controls others	5	5.102	20	7.692	12	5.286	3	4.477
Cooperates	10	10.204	19	7.307	1	.440	11	16.417
Disciplines	7	7.142	7	2.692	8	3.524	4	5.970
Does not discriminate	11	11.224	101	38.846	51	22.466	5	7.462
Encourages	2	2.040	1	.384	2	.881		
Enforces	2	2.040	6	2.307	11	4.845	2	2.985
Expresses satisfaction	13	13.265	8	3.076	3	1.321	14	20.895
Helps	3	3.061	6	2.307	9	3.964		
Improves	5	5.102	1	.384			4	5.970
Permits			1	.384	13	5.726		

BASIC DATA TABLE 3--*Continued*

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98)		Parents (N=260)		Pupils (N=227)		School Officials (N=67)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Controls self	6	6.122	29	11.153	25	11.013	6	8.955
Discusses			11	4.230	19	8.370	2	2.985
Appropriately	3	3.061	12	4.615	9	3.964	2	2.985
Certainty	6	6.122	4	1.538	4	1.762	2	2.985
Cleanliness	1	1.020	3	1.153	1	.440		
Courteously	4	4.081	3	1.153	5	2.202	1	1.492
Creatively	2	2.040	5	1.923	4	1.762	4	5.970
Democratically	4	4.081	5	1.923	6	2.643	3	4.477
Diligently	14	14.285	3	1.153	1	.440	14	20.895
Enthusiastically	1	1.020	2	.769	2	.881		
Ethically	9	9.183	7	2.692	2	.881	2	2.985
Fairly	9	9.183	25	9.615	23	10.132	5	7.462
Firmly	6	6.122	30	11.538	56	24.669	3	4.477
Friendly	7	7.142	20	7.692	11	4.845	6	8.955

BASIC DATA TABLE 3--*Continued*

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98)		Parents (N=260)		Pupils (N=227)		School Officials (N=67)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Good	1	1.020	2	.769	16	7.048		
Happily	11	11.224	28	10.769	29	12.775	6	8.955
Honestly	5	5.102	1	.384			5	7.462
Humorously	4	4.081	5	1.923	14	6.167	2	2.985
Kindly	4	4.081	8	3.076	22	9.691	3	4.477
Knowledgeably	9	9.183	10	3.846	9	3.964	3	4.477
Lovingly	5	5.102	6	2.307	4	1.762	7	10.447
Orderly	10	10.204	11	4.230	5	2.202	10	14.925
Patiently	10	10.204	18	6.923	14	6.167	2	2.985
Personably			4	1.538	1	.440	5	7.462
Pleasantly	3	3.061	5	1.923	12	5.286	1	1.492
Professionally	29	29.591	31	11.923	2	.881	21	31.343
Reasonably	3	3.061	27	10.384	48	21.145		
Sincerely	5	5.102	17	6.538	5	2.202	8	11.940
Thoughtfully	11	11.224	24	9.234	11	4.845	7	10.447

BASIC DATA TABLE 3--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98)		Parents (N=260)		Pupils (N=227)		School Officials (N=67)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Well-groomed	17	17.346	27	10.384	13	5.726	16	23.880
Modern	2	2.040	4	1.538	1	.440	3	4.477
Interesting	2	2.040	3	1.153	10	4.405	3	4.477
Able to	8	8.163	13	5.000	2	8.810	8	11.940
Enjoys	2	2.040	4	1.538			3	4.477
Interested in	11	11.224	30	11.538	4	1.762	8	11.940
Motivated to	2	2.040	2	.769	1	.440	2	2.985
Young	1	1.020	21	8.076	12	5.286	2	2.985
Attractive			1	.384			2	2.985
Pleasant Voice	7	7.142	8	3.076	2	.881		
Smart			1	.384	2	.881	3	4.477
Participates in Community	2	2.040	1	.384			2	2.985
Well educated	1	1.020	7	2.692	2	.881	5	7.462

APPENDIX B-4

BASIC DATA TABLE 4
PERCENTAGE USE BY POSITION OF CONTENT AREAS DESCRIPTIVE OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS--EXPECTATIONS (FORM TWO)

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98)		Parents (N=260)		Pupils (N=227)		School Officials (N=67)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Is Broadminded	22	22.448	18	6.923	7	3.083	9	13.432
Controls Others	4	4.081	9	3.461	8	3.524		
Cooperates	10	10.204	24	9.230	4	1.762	15	22.388
Disciplines	4	4.081	7	2.692	1	.440		
Does Not Discriminate			10	3.846	26	11.453		
Encourages	3	3.061	9	3.461	2	.881		
Enforces	2	2.040	5	1.923	15	6.607	1	1.492
Expresses Satisfaction	5	5.102	3	1.153	6	2.643	1	1.492
Helps	12	12.244	28	10.769	38	16.740	8	11.940
Improves	10	10.204	5	1.923			11	16.417
Permits			2	.769	16	7.048		
Controls Self	3	3.061	7	2.692	12	5.286	4	5.970

BASIC DATA TABLE 4--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98)		Parents (N=260)		Pupils (N=227)		School Officials (N=67)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Discusses	1	1.020	7	2.692	30	13.215		
Appropriately					1	.440		
Certainty	2	2.040	6	2.307	2	.881	3	4.477
Cleanliness	2	2.040	11	4.230	4	1.762		
Courteously	4	4.081	8	3.076	10	4.405	2	2.985
Creatively	3	3.061	8	3.076	4	1.762	7	10.447
Democratically	2	2.040			8	3.524	3	4.477
Diligently	19	19.387	8	3.076	6	2.643	12	17.910
Enthusiastically	4	4.081	6	2.307	4	1.762	6	8.955
Ethically	4	4.081	14	5.384	3	1.321	6	8.955
Fairly	14	14.285	25	9.615	18	7.929	5	7.462
Firmly	4	4.081	18	6.923	56	24.669	3	4.477
Friendly	11	11.224	39	15.000	34	14.977	11	16.417
Good	1	1.020	24	9.230	56	24.669	3	4.477
Happily	9	9.183	10	3.846	15	6.607	5	7.462

BASIC DATA TABLE 4--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98) n	Teachers (N=98) %	Parents (N=260) n	Parents (N=260) %	Pupils (N=227) n	Pupils (N=227) %	School Officials (N=67) n	School Officials (N=67) %
Honestly	5	5.102	13	5.000	3	1.321	11	16.417
Humorously	9	9.183	9	3.461	32	14.096	4	5.970
Kindly	7	7.142	21	8.076	26	11.453	4	5.970
Knowledgeably	10	10.204	15	5.769	16	7.048	8	11.940
Lovingly	15	15.306	51	19.615	13	5.726	12	17.910
Orderly	10	10.204	28	10.769	13	5.726	9	13.432
Patiently	9	9.183	28	10.769	17	7.488	4	5.970
Personably	6	6.122	13	5.000	9	3.964		
Pleasantly	6	6.122	19	7.307	15	6.607	5	7.462
Professionally	24	24.489	51	19.615	1	.440	16	23.880
Reasonably	1	1.020	12	4.615	25	1.101		
Sincerely	11	14.224	16	6.153	3	1.321	14	20.895
Thoughtfully	21	21.428	53	2.384	30	13.215	9	13.432
Well-groomed	15	15.306	17	6.538	15	6.607	10	14.925
Modern	4	4.081	6	2.307	2	.881	1	1.492

BASIC DATA TABLE 4--*Continued*

CONTENT AREA	Teachers (N=98)		Parents (N=260)		Pupils (N=227)		School Officials (N=67)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Interesting	3	3.061	8	3.076	7	3.083	2	2.985
Able to	11	11.224	34	13.076	6	2.643	10	14.925
Enjoys	9	9.183	23	8.846	7	3.083	3	4.477
Interested in	19	19.387	56	21.538	10	4.405	20	29.850
Motivated to	5	5.102	30	11.538			14	20.895
Young	2	2.040	19	7.307	20	8.810	1	1.492
Attractive	1	1.020	2	.769	6	2.643		
Pleasant voice	3	3.061	5	1.923	5	2.202	2	2.985
Smart	3	3.061	13	5.000	8	3.524	7	10.447
Participates in community	8	8.163	9	3.461			10	14.925
Well educated	10	10.204	21	8.076	2	.881	9	13.432

APPENDIX B-5

BASIC DATA TABLE 5
POSITIONAL MEANS FOR POINT-SPREAD ON CONTENT AREAS DESCRIPTIVE OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS--POSITIVE NORMS (FORM TWO)

CONTENT AREA	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Is Broadminded	15	1.000	17	1.000	7	1.000	12	1.000
Controls others	7	1.000	25	1.000	15	1.000	2	1.000
Cooperates	15	1.000	28	1.000	2	1.000	14	1.000
Disciplines	4	1.000	12	1.000	7	1.571	2	1.000
Does not Discriminate	3	2.667	12	1.333	13	1.308		
Encourages	4	1.000	12	1.000	6	1.000		
Enforces	1	1.000	9	1.111	19	1.000	1	1.000
Expresses Satisfaction	1	1.000	1	1.000	1	1.000	1	1.000
Helps	15	1.000	36	1.000	56	1.000	6	1.000
Improves	5	1.000	2	1.000			7	1.000
Permits					20	1.050		

BASIC DATA TABLE 5--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Controls self	2	1.000	10	1.100	8	1.250	4	1.000
Discusses	2	1.000	14	1.000	21	1.000		
Appropriately	2	1.000	2	1.000	4	1.500	1	1.000
Certainty	3	1.000	5	1.000	5	1.000	2	1.000
Cleanliness	5	1.000	11	1.000	3	1.000	4	1.000
Courteously	4	1.000	12	1.000	10	1.100	2	1.000
Creatively	5	1.000	4	2.000	4	2.000	6	1.000
Democratically	4	1.000	3	1.000	5	1.000	4	1.000
Diligently	5	1.000	2	1.000	3	1.000	4	1.000
Enthusiastically	5	1.000	4	1.000	1	1.000	6	1.000
Ethically	4	1.000	35	1.000	2	1.000	6	1.000
Fairly	20	1.000	70	1.114	25	1.080	9	1.000
Firmly	8	1.000	70	1.114	62	2.065	8	1.000
Friendly	30	1.000	52	1.000	36	1.000	12	1.000

BASIC DATA TABLE 5--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Good			1	1.000	49	1.020	1	1.000
Happily	6	1.000	20	1.200	13	1.000	6	1.000
Honestly			12	1.000	3	1.000	7	1.000
Humorously	25	1.000	30	1.000	51	1.059	9	1.000
Kindly	12	1.000	33	1.000	29	1.069	3	1.000
Knowledgeably	23	1.000	31	1.000	21	1.000	17	1.000
Lovingly	21	1.000	32	1.000	6	1.000	13	1.000
Orderly	22	1.000	43	1.000	12	1.000	11	1.000
Patiently	12	1.000	35	1.029	18	1.000	5	1.000
Personably	13	1.000	21	1.000	10	1.100	13	1.000
Pleasantly	20	1.000	43	1.000	26	1.192	7	1.000
Professionally	12	1.000	17	1.000			12	1.000
Reasonably			10	1.400	14	1.071		
Sincerely	10	1.000	15	1.000	4	1.000	12	1.000

BASIC DATA TABLE 5--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Thoughtfully	24	1.000	68	1.000	33	1.000	14	1.000
Well-groomed	17	1.000	21	1.000	17	1.000	13	1.000
Modern	4	1.000	7	1.571	2	3.000		
Interesting	2	1.000	13	1.000	17	1.000	2	1.000
Able to	13	1.000	23	1.217	5	1.000	12	1.000
Enjoys	8	1.000	21	1.000	6	1.000	9	1.000
Interested in	20	1.000	52	1.000	10	1.000	8	1.000
Motivated to	3	1.000	19	1.211			7	1.000
Young	1	1.000	10	2.700	14	2.929	1	4.000
Attractive	5	1.000	5	1.200	12	1.083	1	1.000
Pleasant Voice	5	1.000	11	1.000	5	1.000	2	1.000
Smart	3	1.000	8	1.000	3	1.333	7	1.143
Participates in Community	2	1.000	5	1.000			5	1.000
Well educated	8	1.000	20	1.000	4	1.000	8	1.000

APPENDIX B-6

BASIC DATA TABLE 6
POSITIONAL MEANS FOR POINT-SPREAD ON CONTENT AREAS DESCRIPTIVE OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS--NEGATIVE NORMS (FORM TWO)

CONTENT AREA	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Is Broadminded	27	4.889	37	5.000	15	5.000	13	4.923
Controls others	5	4.400	20	4.800	12	5.000	3	4.667
Cooperates	10	4.900	19	5.000	1	5.000	11	4.636
Disciplines	7	5.000	7	4.429	1	1.000	4	5.000
Does not Discriminate	11	5.000	101	4.921	51	4.922	5	5.000
Encourages	2	5.000	1	5.000	2	5.000		
Enforces			6	3.000	11	3.182	2	3.000
Expresses Satisfaction	13	5.000	8	5.000	3	5.000	14	5.000
Helps	3	5.000	6	5.000	9	4.556		
Improves	5	5.000	1	5.000			4	5.000
Permits			1	1.000	13	4.462		
Controls Self	6	5.000	29	4.966	25	5.000	6	5.000

BASIC DATA TABLE 6--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Discusses			11	4.091	19	4.105	2	3.000
Appropriately	3	5.000	12	5.000	9	5.000	2	5.000
Certainty	6	5.000	4	5.000	4	5.000	2	5.000
Cleanliness	1	5.000	3	5.000	1	5.000	1	5.000
Courteously	4	5.000	3	5.000	5	4.200	1	5.000
Creatively	2	5.000	5	5.000	4	5.000	4	5.000
Democratically	4	5.000	5	5.000	6	5.000	3	5.000
Diligently	14	5.000	3	5.000	1	5.000	14	4.714
Enthusiastically	1	5.000	2	5.000	2	4.500		
Ethically	9	5.000	7	5.000	2	5.000	2	3.000
Fairly	9	5.000	25	5.000	23	4.826	5	5.000
Firmly	6	3.667	30	3.800	56	2.625	3	2.333
Friendly	7	4.429	30	4.933	11	5.000	6	5.000
Good	1	5.000	2	5.000	16	4.750		

BASIC DATA TABLE 6--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Happily	11	5.000	28	5.000	29	4.966	6	5.000
Honestly	5	5.000	1	5.000			5	5.000
Humorously	4	5.000	5	5.000	14	5.000	2	5.000
Kindly	4	5.000	8	5.000	22	5.000	3	3.667
Knowledgeably	9	4.778	10	5.000	9	5.000	3	5.000
Lovingly	5	5.000	6	5.000	4	4.750	7	4.429
Orderly	10	5.000	11	5.000	5	5.000	10	5.000
Patiently	10	5.000	18	4.778	14	5.000	2	5.000
Personably			4	4.750	1	5.000	5	5.000
Pleasantly	3	5.000	5	5.000	12	5.000	1	5.000
Professionally	29	4.931	31	5.000	2	5.000	21	5.000
Reasonably	3	5.000	27	5.000	48	5.000		
Sincerely	5	1.000	17	4.765	5	5.000	8	5.000
Thoughtfully	11	5.000	24	4.958	11	5.000	7	5.000
Well-groomed	17	5.000	27	5.000	13	4.846	16	4.688

BASIC DATA TABLE 6--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Modern	2	5.000	4	5.000	1	1.000	3	4.667
Interesting	2	5.000	3	5.000	10	5.000	3	5.000
Able to	8	4.875	13	5.000	2	5.000	8	5.000
Enjoys	2	5.000	4	5.000			3	5.000
Interested in	11	4.818	30	5.000	4	5.000	8	5.000
Motivated to	2	5.000	2	5.000	1	5.000	2	5.000
Young	1	5.000	21	3.619	12	4.667	2	3.000
Attractive			1	4.000			2	5.000
Pleasant Voice	7	5.000	8	5.000	2	5.000		
Smart			1	5.000	2	4.500	3	5.000
Participates in Community	2	5.000	1	5.000			3	5.000
Well educated	1	5.000	7	4.857	2	5.000	5	4.800

APPENDIX B-7

BASIC DATA TABLE 7
POSITIONAL MEANS FOR POINT-SPREAD ON CONTENT AREAS DESCRIPTIVE OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS-EXPECTATIONS (FORM TWO)

CONTENT AREA	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Is Broadminded	22	2.636	18	2.722	7	3.857	9	3.111
Controls others	4	3.250	9	3.111	8	1.250		
Cooperates	10	1.000	24	1.875	4	1.000	15	1.267
Disciplines	4	4.000	7	1.571	1	1.000		
Does not Discriminate			10	4.200	26	3.346		
Encourages	3	2.333	9	1.556	2	1.000		
Enforces	2	2.500	5	2.600	15	1.867	1	1.000
Expresses Satisfaction	5	4.800	3	4.000	6	4.333	1	1.000
Helps	12	1.333	28	1.321	38	1.184	8	1.000
Improves	10	1.800	5	1.000			11	1.000
Permits			2	1.000	16	2.188		
Controls self	3	3.333	7	1.857	12	3.417	4	1.000

BASIC DATA TABLE 7--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Discusses	1	5.000	7	3.571	30	1.500		
Appropriately					1	5.000		
Certainty	2	3.000	6	2.333	2	1.000	3	3.000
Cleanliness	2	1.000	11	1.091	4	1.000		
Courteously	4	1.000	8	1.000	10	1.100	2	1.000
Creatively	3	2.333	8	3.125	4	2.000	7	3.286
Democratically	2	5.000			8	3.375	3	3.333
Diligently	19	1.737	8	1.500	6	1.667	12	1.333
Enthusiastically	4	1.000	6	1.833	4	2,250	6	1.000
Ethically	4	1.250	14	1.000	3	1.000	6	2.333
Fairly	14	1,357	25	2,120	18	2.389	5	1.800
Firmly	4	1.000	18	2.000	56	1.964	3	1.000
Friendly	11	1.364	39	1.308	34	1.324	11	1.364
Good	1	1.000	24	1.542	56	1.411	3	1.667
Happily	9	1.889	10	3.400	15	2.400	5	1.600

BASIC DATA TABLE 7--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Honestly	5	1.200	13	1.308	3	2.000	11	1.000
Humorously	9	1.444	9	1.111	32	1.813	4	1.500
Kindly	7	1.429	21	1.000	26	1.654	4	2.000
Knowledgeably	10	1.500	15	1.600	16	1.813	8	1.875
Lovingly	15	1.067	51	1.294	13	1.154	12	1.000
Orderly	10	1.000	28	1.071	13	1.308	9	1.111
Patiently	9	1.444	28	2.036	17	1.765	4	1.000
Personably	6	2.167	13	1.769	9	1.333	4	2.000
Pleasantly	6	1.000	19	1.000	15	1.067	5	1.000
Professionally	24	2.667	51	2.961	1	1.000	16	2.188
Reasonably	1	5.000	12	3.667	25	3.000		
Sincerely	11	1.091	16	1.875	3	1.000	14	1.000
Thoughtfully	21	1.190	53	1.679	30	1.500	9	1.000
Well-groomed	15	2.000	17	1.824	15	1.400	10	1.900

BASIC DATA TABLE 7--Continued

CONTENT AREA	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Modern	4	2.000	6	2.500	2	3.000	1	5.000
Interesting	3	1.333	8	1.875	7	2.714	2	3.000
Able to	11	2.455	34	1.882	6	2.000	10	2.600
Enjoys	9	1.000	23	1.087	7	1.143	3	1.000
Interested in	19	1.263	55	1.727	10	1.500	20	1.250
Motivated to			2	1.000				
Young	2	3.000	19	3.368	20	2.950	1	5.000
Attractive	1	1.000	2	1.000	6	1.333		
Pleasant Voice	3	1.000	5	1.800	5	1.000	2	1.000
Smart	3	1.667	13	1.385	8	1.875	7	1.286
Participates in Community	8	2.000	9	1.000			10	2.100
Well educated	10	2.800	21	1.810	2	1.000	9	2.111

APPENDIX B-8

BASIC DATA TABLE 8
POSITIONAL MEANS FOR COGNITIONS DEALING WITH TEACHER BEHAVIORS--POSITIVE NORMS (FORM FOUR)

TEACHER BEHAVIOR	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Watching pupils during study period	30	3.466	74	3.770	55	3.363	17	3.588
Supervising pupils in a classroom test	30	3.800	74	4.067	55	3.454	16	4.125
Singing during a classroom singing period	29	3.448	73	3.835	53	3.679	17	3.470
Ignoring pupils misbehaving in a classroom	30	2.000	71	1.507	54	2.333	17	1.823
Keeping pupils quiet in the library	29	4.034	73	4.561	52	4.057	17	4.117
Speaking out at PTA meeting in the auditorium	30	2.366	73	3.164	51	3.098	17	2.823
Policing the halls	29	2.965	73	3.876	55	3.145	17	3.235
Disciplining pupils during basketball game in the gym	30	2.533	73	3.109	52	3.384	17	2.764

BASIC DATA TABLE 8--*Continued*

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Visiting with other teachers on the playground	30	2.233	73	2.328	54	2.777	17	2.411
Cooperating with other teachers in school	30	4.733	73	4.698	53	4.433	17	4.882
Visiting with other teachers during study period	29	1.448	71	1.929	63	1.952	17	1.352
Watching for cheaters during a classroom test	29	3.206	70	3.528	64	3.812	17	2.764
Having pupils sing solos during a classroom singing period	29	2.310	71	2.366	66	2.151	17	2.000
Telling misbehaving pupils in the classroom to stop talking	29	3.000	71	3.422	64	3.406	17	2.704
Doing own studying and grading in the library	29	3.000	70	3.385	63	3.301	17	2.647
Attending PTA meetings in the auditorium	29	3.379	71	3.859	63	4.238	17	4.235
Allowing pupils to explore during experiments in the laboratory	29	2.965	70	3.128	59	3.661	17	3.647
Kibitzing during basketball in gym	29	2.034	69	2.208	58	2.327	17	1.941

BASIC DATA TABLE 8--*Continued*

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Supervising on playground	29	3.379	70	4.242	64	3.640	17	4.058
Cooperating with the principal in school	29	4.986	70	4.700	63	4.428	17	4.764
Reading own books during study period	15	1.400	47	2.170	40	3.000	8	1.250
Leaving the room during a classroom test	15	1.133	46	1.369	37	1.864	8	1.250
Grading papers during a classroom singing period	15	1.133	44	1.590	37	2.081	8	1.000
Threatening pupils misbehaving in the classroom	15	1.800	46	2.630	39	2.282	8	1.250
Choosing books for pupils in the classroom	15	2.400	47	2.978	37	2.945	8	2.500
Visiting with parents during PTA meeting in the auditorium	15	2.533	46	3.000	40	3.300	8	3.875
Being partisan during football game on athletic field	15	2.600	43	2.906	36	3.444	8	2.875
Doing menial tasks during basketball game in gym	15	1.466	43	1.767	37	2.378	8	2.125

BASIC DATA TABLE 8--Continued

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Disciplining pupils in cafeteria	15	2.266	46	3.369	39	2.974	8	2.625
Participating in community activities out of school	15	3.000	45	2.888	39	3.666	8	3.375

APPENDIX B-9

BASIC DATA TABLE 9
POSITIONAL MEANS FOR COGNITIONS DEALING WITH TEACHER BEHAVIORS--NEGATIVE NORMS (FORM FOUR)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Watching pupils during study period	30	2.066	72	1.527	53	2.490	17	1.705
Supervising pupils in a classroom test	30	1.400	72	1.458	52	2.384	17	1.235
Singing during a classroom singing period	29	2.241	72	1.472	51	2.196	17	1.941
Ignoring pupils misbehaving in a classroom	30	4.200	73	4.589	54	3.685	17	5.000
Keeping pupils quiet in the library	29	1.413	73	1.232	50	1.880	17	1.235
Speaking out at PTA meeting in the auditorium	30	3.966	73	2.520	50	2.880	17	3.529
Policing the halls	29	2.655	73	1.383	54	2.944	17	1.941
Disciplining pupils during basketball game in gym	30	3.133	73	2.000	50	2.760	17	2.647

BASIC DATA TABLE 9--*Continued*

TEACHER BEHAVIOR	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Visiting with other teachers on the playground	30	4.333	72	4.041	53	3.169	17	4.764
Cooperating with other teachers in school	30	1.000	73	1.068	53	1.339	17	1.000
Visiting with other teachers during study period	29	4.724	68	4.279	63	4.238	18	4.555
Watching for cheaters during a classroom test	29	3.379	68	2.441	58	2.206	18	3.055
Having pupils sing solos during a classroom singing period	29	4.448	68	3.955	63	3.634	18	3.833
Telling misbehaving pupils in the classroom to stop talking	29	2.793	69	2.405	60	2.983	18	3.500
Doing own studying and grading in the library	29	3.206	67	2.134	59	2.762	18	3.444
Attending PTA meetings in the auditorium	29	1.896	69	1.318	59	1.559	18	1.444
Allowing pupils to explore during experiments in the laboratory	29	2.689	69	2.014	57	2.035	18	2.222
Kibitzing during basketball game in gym	28	4.428	67	4.014	57	3.421	18	4.111

BASIC DATA TABLE 9--Continued

TEACHER BEHAVIOR	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Supervising on playground	29	2.103	68	1.220	62	2.370	13	2.000
Cooperating with the principal in school	29	1.448	69	1.130	58	2.120	18	1.222
Reading own books during study period	14	4.714	14	4.022	34	3.264	7	5.000
Leaving the room during a classroom test	14	4.857	45	4.444	39	4.000	7	4.571
Grading papers during a classroom singing period	14	4.928	43	4.325	34	3.588	7	4.571
Threatening pupils misbehaving in the classroom	14	5.000	43	3.558	37	3.945	7	4.857
Choosing books for pupils in the classroom	14	3.857	42	2.880	35	3.085	7	4.571
Visiting with parents during PTA meeting in the auditorium	14	3.571	43	2.348	36	2.750	7	1.714
Being partisan during football game on athletic field	14	3.428	42	2.976	37	2.594	7	3.428
Doing menial tasks during basketball game in gym	14	5.000	43	4.069	37	3.432	7	4.571

BASIC DATA TABLE 9--Continued

TEACHER BEHAVIOR	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Disciplining pupils in cafeteria	14	3.571	44	2.409	35	3.571	7	2.571
Participating in community activities out of school	13	2.846	43	1.720	33	2.272	7	2.285

APPENDIX B-10

BASIC DATA TABLE 10
POSITIONAL MEANS FOR COGNITIONS DEALING WITH TEACHER BEHAVIORS--EXPECTATIONS (FORM FOUR)

TEACHER BEHAVIOR	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Watching pupils during study period	31	3.193	75	3.560	57	3.368	18	3.666
Supervising pupils in a classroom test	30	3.866	75	3.866	56	3.178	18	4.333
Singing during a classroom singing period	31	3.548	75	3.880	57	3.624	18	3.500
Ignoring pupils misbehaving in a classroom	31	2.032	74	1.716	56	1.946	18	1.833
Keeping pupils quiet in the library	31	4.129	75	4.546	57	4.140	18	4.166
Speaking out at PTA meeting in the auditorium	31	1.483	75	2.746	54	2.611	18	2.222
Policing the halls	31	2.967	75	3.640	57	3.315	18	3.277
Disciplining pupils during basketball game in the gym	31	2.290	75	2.866	53	3.207	18	2.500

BASIC DATA TABLE 10--*Continued*

TEACHER BEHAVIOR	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Visiting with other teachers on the playground	31	2.677	75	2.346	57	2.666	18	2.277
Cooperating with other teachers in school	31	4.580	75	4.693	57	4.508	18	4.777
Visiting with other teachers during study period	30	1.333	70	1.800	66	2.000	18	1.666
Watching for cheaters during a classroom test	30	3.333	70	3.471	65	3.676	18	3.000
Having pupils sing solos during a classroom singing period	30	2,166	70	2.200	66	1.863	18	1.944
Telling misbehaving pupils in the classroom to stop talking	30	3.133	70	3.428	66	3.696	18	2.722
Doing own studying and grading in the library	30	2.766	69	3.391	63	3.380	18	2.444
Attending PTA meetings in the auditorium	30	3.433	70	4.085	64	4.078	18	4.222
Allowing pupils to explore during experiments in the laboratory	30	2.700	67	3.164	60	2.866	18	3.444
Kibitzing during basketball game in gym	30	2.100	68	2.000	58	2.327	18	2.222

BASIC DATA TABLE 10--Continued

TEACHER BEHAVIOR	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Supervising on playground	30	3.733	70	4.085	65	3.769	18	3.833
Cooperating with the principal in school	30	4.833	69	4.710	65	4.446	18	4.555
Reading own books during study period	12	1.416	46	2.543	39	2.923	6	1.333
Leaving the room during a classroom test	12	1.000	46	1.326	39	1.461	6	1.000
Grading papers during a classroom singing period	12	1.083	46	1.956	38	2.210	6	1.000
Threatening pupils misbehaving in the classroom	12	2.333	45	2.488	38	2.684	6	1.500
Choosing books for pupils in the classroom	12	2.666	43	3.232	37	3.054	6	2.666
Visiting with parents during PTA meeting in the auditorium	12	2.916	46	3.043	39	3.717	6	3.666
Being partisan during football game on athletic field	12	2.750	44	2.977	39	3.128	6	2.500
Doing menial tasks during basketball game in gym	12	1.750	45	2.022	37	2.454	6	2.000

BASIC DATA TABLE 10--Continued

TEACHER BEHAVIOR	Teachers		Parents		Pupils		School Officials	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Disciplining pupils in cafeteria	12	2.666	46	3.478	39	3.282	6	3.166
Participating in community activities out of school	12	2.916	45	2.844	38	3.394	6	3.166

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Monographs

Barker, Roger G., and Wright, Herbert F. *Midwest and Its Children*. Evanston: Row, Peterson, and Co., 1954.

Biddle, Bruce J., and Simpson, Ann M. *A Program for the Processing of Ordinal Data and Computation of Significance for Selected Central Tendency Differences*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1961.

Charters, W. W., and Waples, D. *The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Festinger, Leon. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Evanston: Row, Peterson, and Co., 1957.

Gross, Neal, Mason, Ward S., and McEachern, Alexander W. *Explorations in Role Analysis*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Hare, A. Paul, Borgatta, Edgar F., and Bales, Robert F. *Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

Parsons, Talcott. *The Social System*. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951.

Parsons, Talcott, and Shils, Edward A. *Toward A General Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Rommetveit, R. *Social Norms and Roles*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Siegel, Sidney. *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.

Stiles, Lindley J. (ed.) *The Teacher's Role in American Society*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Theory and Methods. Vol. I of *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Edited by Gardner Lindzey. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Periodicals

Doyle, Louis A. "Convergence and Divergence in the Role Expectations of Elementary Teachers," *College of Education Quarterly*, IV (January, 1958), 3-9.

Getzels, J. W., and Guba, E. G. "The Structure of Role and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, XXIX (September, 1955), 30-40.

Gullahorn, John T. "Measuring Role Conflict," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXI (January, 1956), 299-303.

Haer, J. "The Public Views the Teacher," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XVIII (September, 1953), 202-204.

Kline, Frances F. "Satisfactions and Annoyances in Teaching," *Journal of Experimental Education*, XVIII (December, 1949), 77-89.

Laulicht, Jerome. "Role Conflict: The Pattern Variable Theory and Scalogram Analysis," *Social Forces*, XXXIII (March, 1955), 250-54.

Neiman, L. J., and Hughes, J. W. "The Problem of the Concept of Role - A Re-survey of the Literature," *Social Forces*, XXX (December, 1951), 141-49.

Richey, R. W., and Fox, W. H. "How Do Teachers Compare with Other Community Members?" *Educational Research Bulletin*, XXVII (December, 1948), 238-41.

Seeman, Melvin. "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership," *American Sociological Review*, XVIII (August, 1953), 373-80.

Smith, V. F. "What Kind of Teachers do Parents Like? What Kind of Parents do Teachers Like?" *Understanding the Child*, XXII (October, 1953), 99-103.

Spears, H. "What Disturbs the Beginning Teacher," *School Review*, LIII (October, 1945), 458-63.

Stouffer, Samuel. "An Analysis of Conflicting Social Norms," *American Sociological Review*, XIV (December, 1949), 707-17.

Terrien, F. "Who Thinks What About Educators?" *American Journal of Sociology*, LIX (September, 1953), 150-58.

Toby, Jackson. "Some Variables in Role Conflict Analysis," *Social Forces*, XXX (March, 1952), 323-27.

Unpublished Material

Bates, Alan P. "Role Conflict and Its Resolution." University of Nebraska, 1959. (Typewritten.)

Biddle, Bruce J., Twyman, J. Paschal, and Rankin, E. F., Jr. "The Concept of Role Conflict." University of Kansas City, 1960. (Dittoed.)

Biddle, Bruce J., Twyman, J. Paschal, and Rankin, E. F., Jr. "The Role of the Teacher and Occupational Choice." 1961. (Forthcoming in *School Review*.)

Guba, E. G. "Role, Personality, and Social Behavior." Ohio State University, 1958. (Mimeographed.)

Gullahorn, John T., and Gullahorn, Jeanne E. "A Model for Role Conflict Analysis." Michigan State University, 1959. (Mimeographed.)